Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 60 ST. LOUIS, MO. OCT. 1, 1932

SERMON SKETCHES

By F. C. Rueggeberg

Sunday — November 6, 1932

Things to Think On!—Text: Philippians 4: 8

"Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."

The Ministry of Thought! "As a man thinketh in his heart."

I. "Whatsoever things are true"

Word "true" not as used in law court.—Things described in police-court as true are usually ugly and repulsive.—The Truth is always beautiful.—Truth in police-court, correspondence with fear. —Truth in N. T., correspondence with God. An unclean story may be accurate. It can never be "true". It is out of balance. Not in harmony with God. A story is true when in very structure it shares the likeness of Him who is Truth. Pilate, "What is truth?" misses the mark. Jesus: "He that is of the Truth," is right.

II. "Whatsoever things are honorable"—honest, straight

Things worthy of reverence, things august, things venerable, suggesting strength and dignity of a vast cathedral pile. Think on these things that can make the character of men to resemble an inspiring Cathedral.

III. "Whatsoever things are just," i. e., adjusted to the Maker.

Not superficial exactitude as Scribes and Pharisees, with their arid, barren, legalistic justice, but the Justice of God. Amos: "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream."

IV. "Whatsoever things are pure"

"Blessed are the pure in heart."—"Keep thy heart with all diligence."—"Who shall ascend unto the hill of the Lord?"—"He that hath clean hands and a pure heart."

V. "Whatsoever things are lovely"

Not mere sensuous enjoyment of form and color, but the beauty of moral earnestness.—The Cross of Christ tells the story of beauty of obedience.—The truly beautiful is the Divine.—It is inward, not outward beauty.—We must have something of the iron and hardness of the cross in our character.

VI. "Whatsoever things are of good report"

Not things which are well reported of, but things which themselves speak with a fine voice—in one word, things that have their springs in reality.—"If there be any virtue and any praise, think on these things."

Sunday — November 13, 1932

THINGS OF CAESAR AND THINGS OF GOD! Matthew 22: 21

"Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things which are God's."

The Master always carried a question with him! At age of 12—"sitting in midst of doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions." He learned to use the interrogation point early in life! He has been asking questions ever since.

I. The Question: "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not?"

Jesus' answer: "Render unto Caesar, Render unto God."—That does not mean that we are to pay Caesar his tax and let the Cause of God go begging.—Many people operate that way! They pay their taxes. They secure the property rights under the state. They strive to "render unto Caesar what belongs to Him."—Their religion is divided into two great parts: One the State. The other—God—or the Church.

Jesus does not say—there are two Kingdoms—one of the world—temporal authority. Other—the Church—spiritual power.—That is what it looks like on the surface.—But underneath is another meaning: You use that coin to buy what you want. You accept the protection and enjoy the comfort and advantages of the civil government. Then pay your share of the cost.—Paul: "Trib-

ute to whom tribute is due! Custom to whom custom. Fear to whom fear. Honor to whom honor."—Here is what we seek! We must find out what our obligations are and to whom they are owed and then meet them as honest men.

II. But more needs to be said!

Treat your church in the same way.—Find out where your obligations lie and meet them like honest men.

A. There can never be a division in the Church between secular and sacred interests.

Everything is sacred in the Church. Everything is sacred to mind of Christian. Nothing is sacred to a secular mind. Nothing is secular to a saintly soul.—The money problem or the financial problem in our church is a spiritual problem. You dare not separate what we owe Caesar from what we owe to God. Because both of these obligations lie in the moral realm! And the moral realm is peculiarly the realm of religion.

B. There can never be a division between Business and religion.

"Business is business"; as though there were laws operating in business which have no place in Kingdom of God! Either all life is a holy thing or the entire demands of the Christian Gospel are a sham. The same loyalty, devotion, thought and enterprise used and expended in business. That same thoroughnes we must bring into our religion.

C. There can never be a division between my Church and the Kingdom program of the denomination.

"My Church"—Caesar. "The Synod"—some foreign interest.

Now, my friends, what we need and ought to do is: to pay the salaries of a few missionaries on foreign or home field instead of complaining of the size of the synodical budget! That would give us interest in the Cause!

Moreover—the Church that does nothing in missionary endeavor—will die of starvation. The Gospel of Jesus (Livingstone) needs perpetual propagation. It is a missionary Gospel. Its program is a world program. God's purposes are world-girdling and call for the whole power of the Church. "The whole task of the whole church is to bring the whole Gospel to the whole World."

Sunday — November 20, 1932

THINGS JESUS TELLS US TO DO!

"And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 6: 46.

"And he spake a parable unto them"—in fact four parables:

1. "The Blind leading the blind—ditch." A lesson on Leadership.

2. "The Splinter and beam." A lesson on Self-examination.

3. "The good and bad tree." A lesson on the organic relation between the inner life and the outward conduct.

4. "The wise and foolish builders." A lesson on the necessity of founding the Life on the Divine Will.

"Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say!" Heart and mouth must have a common life-principle if anything of worth is to issue forth. What shall it profit though a man gratefully and habitually utters all the litanies of earth—if these words are mere lip-service?

Problem: not orthodoxy of creed but orthodoxy of conduct.

Things Jesus asks us to do—what things? Are there so many we know not where to begin?

"So many books, so many creeds,
So many paths that wind and wind,
While just the art of being kind
Is all this old world needs."

You can read all Jesus ever said, in short hours of a Sunday afternoon.

There are only two very simple things which Chirst asks us to do:

I. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul ,and with all thy strength and with all thy might."

A. First in our thought.—"Seek ye first His Kingdom and His righteousness." Ruskin—"I do not wonder at what men suffer, I often wonder at what they lose."

B. First in our business.—Is business first or shall God be first?

C. First in our home.

D. First in our politics.—Cecil Rhodes—Some men think in villages, some in towns, some in cities, some in terms of continents; only God thinks in terms of the Universe." "Go ye unto all the world."

E. First in our civilization.—Peace Palace at Hague.—Nations asked to send statues as expressions of their good will. No word of Christ. No statue of Him was to be accepted. Yet two South American nations sent bronze statue of Jesus Christ. Had no place to put it—so placed it at the entrance.

II. And then Jesus tells us to do the second thing: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

And who is my neighbor? Illustration. A certain man went one day from Jerusalem to Jericho; fell among thieves. Priest—Levite—Samaritan.

"Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Jacob Ries—"How the other half lives." But thousands decline to keep their unfortunate brethren.

John Spargo utters "The Cry of the children." 2,000,000 of them, under 16 years of age, working at gainful occupations—yet what do we do to stop the disgrace?

Lincoln Steffens shows up "The Shame of the Cities" and brings a blush to the face of many a patriot—but when time and energy and money are needed—the love of many waxes cold!

"Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"

Sunday — November 27, 1932

"Things That Make for Peace"

"These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace."—John 16: 33a.

What things:

They were in the upper Room. John—the Son of Thunder—with the mind of the mystic and the heart of a Lover—has told us what these things were: Chapt. 13—The Feet Washing; Chapt. 14—"In my Father's House"; Chapt. 15—"I am the Vine"; Chapt. 16—"He is going away and they are to remain."

The Shepherd is to be removed by hands of sinful men and the sheep will be scattered.

The Master is going to leave them and they are to rely wholly on the strength of inner union with Him through prayer—to bravely "carry on".

Their strength and confidence is to be sought in prayer: "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, the Father will give it you!" "These things have I spoken unto you, that in Me ye might have peace." Luther: "You must write the personal pronoun I very large—"These things have I spoken unto you—" The "I" here is of tremendous importance.

1) Not the "I" of the artist—who leads us to appreciation of the beautiful.

2) Not the author—who instructs us here.

3) Not the "I" of the Scientist who gathers all facts together to make them into a great system of Knowledge.

4) Not the "I" of the philosopher who sees behind the scene of life, its one abiding meaning.

5) Neither is it an inventor that Christ speaks of—not that kind of an "I".

6) Not the "I" of a soldier nor a statesman.

Not one of then has ever said: "These things have "I" spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace.

I. Jesus rests His claim solely and alone on Himself—on His own flawless character.

This, I say, is distinctive and it is also different than anything we ever hear from world's greatest men. Christianity is a way of Life, or Religion, that cannot be separated from the person of Jesus. You cannot study Christianity without Christ. You cannot divorce the Religion of Christ from the person of Christ—these two belong together and no man may ever sunder them.

A. To study the N. T. is to study Jesus. He is the heart and fiber of its entire life. Take Him out of the N. T. and you leave nothing but a lifeless mass of meaningless phrases.

B. To be a Christian is to follow Him. Everywhere He makes this very, very plain.

Illustration. "Good Master, what must I do, to inherit eternal life?" Jesus: Why callest thou Me good, there is none good, save one, that is God." That is to say: there is no acceptance of God possible, without accepting Christ.

Illustration. "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter, speaking for the apostles and for us all, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God."

II. Jesus rests His claim entirely on Himself and then He says: "Follow Me." "Watch Me." "Learn of Me."

Now what may we learn?

A. His almost haunting sense of the presence of God in His life. "He and His Father were one."

B. His constant reliance on the spiritual power of His faith to overcome all obstacles. There is something solemnly awful in the presence of a man who relies entirely upon spiritual force to accomplish His ends.

C. His utter abandon and lack of worldly goods in the furtherance of His cause. We usually invert the order. The most successful Church is the most active or outwardly influential Church. Whereas the Master cared nothing for things as things.

D. His constant Habit of Prayer. I know it is a worn-out phrase—but: How often do you pray? How much do you pray? For what do you pray? How fervently do you pray? Jesus prayed always: for Himself; for His own; for His cause.

"In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world."

Sunday — December 4, 1932

"Things That Are Impossible"

"The things which are impossible with men are possible with God"—Luke 18: 27.

Illustration. The Rich Young Ruler coming to Jesus.

Jesus: "Easier it is for a camel to go through the needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God."

Disciples: "Then who can be saved?"

Jesus: "The things that are impossible for men are possible for God."

I. The Impossibility without God.

Many leave God out of count. How many times that happens in life.

A. Here is a life in straightened circumstances, fine idealism of earlier days gone. World is gray and practical and life is very difficult in its complexity.

Question: "After all does it pay to be good?"

Since so many hundreds over-reach and do that which is not right—Who then can be saved?

1) "Christianity is an impossible religion."

2) "Jesus is an impossible idealist."

3) "The N. T. is an impracticable Book."

4) "The Church is conducting a losing business."

All this is so beacuse we leave God out of reckoning. Put God into the program of your life!

B. Here again are people overwhelmed with the mysteries of Sorrow and Suffering. They cannot find the way out. Life has been sapped of all fine dreams. Once more—let us remember God.

C. Again! The world on a larger scale leaves God out of count. Apparently—world does not need Him.

Arabian proverb:

1) "He who knows and knows he knows is a proud man—shun him.

2) He who knows not and knows not that he knows not—he is a fool—pity him.

3) He who knows not and knows that he knows not—he is a child—teach him.

Perhaps the world does not know that it needs God and so must be taught.

II. The Possibility of the Impossible.

"All of the things which Jesus asks us to do are impossible, only they are so necessary that we must make them possible."

A. Jesus asks us to believe in the eternal goodness of God.

It makes a great deal of difference what we believe—for belief shapes and molds character.

B. Jesus asks us to believe in the Brotherhood of man. Impossible—then we must make it a fact.

Wm. James: "Is Life worth living?"—"Believe that it is and you will help create the fact."

C. Jesus asks us to believe in the ultimate triumph of faith.

Paul: "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God." Peter and John: "What were they asked?"—not how did you cure him? but: "By what authority and in whose name did you preach?" The Reformation—began by preaching the faith.

III. The real Hindrance.—Not the Anarchist, or the open foes; Not the Atheist, or the Agnostic. But thousands and thousands who have not the faith to tackle the impossible.

Jesus: "All things are possible with God."

Sunday — December 11, 1932

"We are persuaded better things of you and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak."—Hebrews 6: 9.

"Salvation"—What do we mean by the term?

A ship at sea is saved when the reefs and shoals are passed. Holland was saved when the waters were driven back. A house is saved by the streams that put out the flame, or the beams that shore up its walls. A living organism is saved by restoring the equilibrium of nature and by prompting the vital organs to do their work. A prodigal is saved by the memory of his mother's face or some sweet reminder from home.

How is a soul saved? In much the same way. It is by believing in the possibilities of goodness—until that goodness becomes a part of us. It is bowing before the majesty of Christ's life until to be like Him becomes a passion. A soul is "saved" when it has found the perfect ideal and dynamic for its life in the person of Christ.

What are some of the things that accompany salvation?

I. A Unified Personality!

Two natures—higher and lower—in every man: "Flesh against Spirit—Spirit contra flesh." Paul: "The good that I would I do not, the evil I would not, that I do." We all know the story of this struggle: forfeiture to convenience; compromise for advantage; materialism for practical gain; the higher or God-consciousness—sacrificed to the lower or selfish motives of life, which make for unbelief and shallowness.

Read pages of O. T.—one long struggle between the God in man and the devil in man.

History teaches by example—the same old truth: God-consciousness struggling contra selfish ideals and ideas.

When a soul is saved—it throws the energies of its life into the hands of the God-ward ideals, henceforth God rules the life.

The old struggle is not ended—but the ideas of God-consciousness move into the central field of life and, by the marvelous power of God, they are strong enough to hold sway.

The Personality Unified—henceforth the watchword: "This one thing I do."

II. A new appreciation of the Self.

When a man is saved—he is saved for some high end—"saved to serve". Life becomes an elevated and a lofty destiny. Prodigal —"I will arise and go to my father." A man joins church—becomes conscious at once of powers which he did not dream existed for him.

III. A new Center of Loyalty.

Salvation gives a man an ideal for life and service great enough wholly to command him.

Geo. MacDonald—"Nothing makes a man so strong as a cry for help." Comes home from a hard day's work—hears a cry of distress—all other interests immediately forgotten—one passion or idea dominates him—his whole person becomes loyal to one consuming aim—to help the one in need.

Salvation brings into the soul, the motive power of a new affection—centralized in Christ, the Master personality of the Ages!

In the Church this is sorely needed—new center of loyalty. Everything—for the one aim of exalting the person and the will and work of Christ.

IV. A Peaceful mind and heart.

Jesus: "Seek ye first His Kingdom and His Righteousness." "One thing only is needful." Paul—"The Peace of God, which passeth all understanding."

Salvation—puts the heart and the mind to rest—i. e., gives them the consciousness of unquestioned trust.

Sunday — December 18, 1932

"Things Lawful But Not Expedient"

"All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient." 1 Cor. 6: 12.

Goodspeed: "I may do anything I please, but not everything I may do is good for me." "I may do anything I please; but I am not going to let anything master me."

Liberty is not license. Freedom does not mean lawlessness. Choice does not imply freedom from obligation. Luther—"The Freedom of a Christian."

1. A Christian is a free man and no one's servant.

2. A Christian is a Servant and in bondage to all men.

"All things are possible to me, but all things are not good for me." Liberty is controlled by the rights of others. Freedom is limited by profits of others. Cervantes: "The stars in heaven are free because in the amplitude of their liberty their joy is to obey the laws."

Three ways in which world has tried to meet the situation described by Apostle in chapter before us:

I. The Greek World—culture—self-development. Said through its greatest soul—Socrates: "Know Thyself!" Know whence you have come. Know what you are. Know whither you are going.

II. The Roman World—Law—Government and Order.

Marcus Aurelius: "Control Thyself." It too is a great word—Control thyself.

Illustration. Cincinnati Zoological Garden—sign: "Do not poke animals!" Lady with umbrella. She poked them and lost her umbrella. Something like that in human heart: Lion of rage; tiger of passion; serpent of deceit. Do not poke the animals!

David S. Jordan: "Self-control, its Kingship and majesty"—"All things are lawful for me, but all things are under control—for the sake of others."

Right there the Church makes a great appeal. She says: "Let the plesaures of the moment alone and control your desires for the good of others.

III. Christ says: not "Know thyself" nor "Control Thyself" but "Deny Thyself."

Enoch Arden—"I will deny myself" and in one minute, in 60 seconds, God had made another king.

Father and Three sons—a piece of clay. 1. Made a beautiful figure of Greek art; 2. Made a vase; 3. Tried to mold an image of his father's face.

'Tis not what we can do—what we have the right to do, so much as what we do not for the sake of others, that counts with God!

"Deny thyself"—said Jesus. 1. Deny thyself to thyself—lower self to higher. 2 Deny thyself for Fellowmen—as Chas. Darnley in "Tale of two cities."

Deny thyself—for some great cause—as Jesus did on the Cross.

"All things are lawful unto Me, but all things are not expedient." Many things I can do—but will not: For the good of others. For the profit of others.

Sunday — December 25, 1932

"This Thing Which Is Come to Pass"

"Let us now go even unto Bethlehem, and see this thing which is come to pass" Luke 2 : 15.

What is the real, the abiding meaning of Christmas? Christmas has Christ in it.

a) Take Christ out of Christmas and you take the sun out of the N. T. The birth of Jesus is the sunrise of the Bible. No Christ—there is no new Evangel.

b) Take Christ out of Christmas and you take the center of gravity out of the human race.

'Tis He that has restored to man the proper sense of values. He is the balance-power of life. His Life is of one piece—even, clean, flawless. Without Him—Life is empty, meaningless.

c) Take Christ out of Christmas and you take away the source of motive and the stimulus of right living out of human life.

Bring forward a more searching or helpful message—without Him—and every minister in Christendom will declare it to His people.

d) Take Christ out of Christmas and you take civilization out of the world, reduce the race to barbarism.

Christmas has Christ in it! "Let us go even unto Bethlehem and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord hath made known unto us."

What had the Lord revealed unto them?

I. The Birth of the Saviour.

While they were in the fields, an angel appeared unto them—God sent them a message—while they watched their flocks. One of the many indications that: the highest truths are not discovered but are revealed. "Canst thou by searching find out God?"

II. When the Shepherds went to Bethlehem—they saw a little child, "A Saviour. who is Christ the Lord."

Up to that moment, always it had been a man, full grown, who occupied the center of the stage. Bethlehem has changed all that and has given us a new sense of values—in the child.

Shepherds saw that this new-born Saviour was not born of the rich nor of the extremely poor—but of the middle class (where most of world's leaders have come from).

Christ was born at center of Gravity of human race; of honorable class of working people. The world is saved by the labors of God with Man. It is work that gets things done, Christ was a working-man.

III. Three questions in Summary.

1) Do you know him—the Christ?

Not—know about Christ; nor—what you know; but—whom you know.

2) Is He your Saviour and Lord?

Have you entered into the meaning of the "unto you, is born this day?" That is the personal element in Christianity. Failure to commit one's self to Him is the reason why we do not have more victories than we do have in the Church. There is no substitute for Him.

3) Do you love and worship Him? Is He your Lord and Master? "Acquaint now thyself with Him and be at peace."

WHY NOT CATHOLIC?

Written by R. Stave and based in parts on a dissertation by Prof. D. Otto Schmitz in Muenster

What justification is there for this question in the minds of Evangelical dissenters?

Many of us have acquired the habit of forming a hasty reply in categorical form. "Festina lente!" May this well-known maxim of Emperor Augustus guide us in a patient and reasonable examination of the facts, stripped, as it were, of confessional polemics, so that our final conclusions may stand approved before the tribunal of our conscience.

Should not this question interest us in view of the fact that the Catholic church is progressively manifesting her influence intellectually, politically and culturally?

In a 10,000 word memorandum, which appeared in excerpt form in a very recent issue of the New York Tribune, John Moody, one of the respected citizens of the metropolis, sets forth his reasons for having become a convert to Catholicism two years ago. From his published statement we are here quoting only its more relevant sentences:

"It was through the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas that I found the way. It was through him that for the first time in my life I came clearly to understand Christianity and its meaning. Then I made what was for me the surprising discovery that the Catholic Church alone of all Christian bodies had been teaching for 1900 years, and still is teaching, the only interpretation of the Bible and the life of Christ that makes sense.

"The Catholic Church from the outside had never interested me. All my life I was reeking with prejudice against it. But these prejudices melted away when I finally recognized it as the possessor of timeless truth.

"But why the Catholic Church? Why not Protestantism? Well, I had been a Protestant all my life; first an orthodox one and finally a modern one. But all that Protestantism had ever done for me—or to me—was to lead me by slow degrees into indifferentism and then into practical agnosticism. When I started I believed a lot; when I finished, there was little tangible to believe outside of glittering generalities. During the more than 40 years in which I classed myself as an Episcopalian I saw the Bible torn to shreds and tatters within my own church, the Christian story turned into a fable, and Christ completely shorn of the supernatural. Moreover different factions within the church were teaching contradictory things and always throwing bricks at each other.

"I am often asked, now that I have been a Catholic for a considerable period, whether I have found Catholicism all I had hoped. Yes, and more. If there is one thing about the Catholic life which is the very reverse of what one finds in Protestantism, it is that one grows and grows more strongly into the faith. It gives life a purpose and a meaning—which no philosophy of negation can ever do.

"An unlettered layman like myself, if at all studious, flounders through modern philosophy, as I did for a quarter of a century, trying to convince himself that life has no supernatural meaning and that man is merely an accidental animal evolved out of the loom of time. He feels it ridiculous to even question these great thinkers with all their learning and wisdom; he merely accepts their dogmas as final. Eventually I rose above this complex, but it was a loadstone for many years."

If the growing number of prominent converts to the Catholic faith may serve as a criterion, then the question becomes at once pertinent, Why indeed did these people become Catholics? In their endeavor to justify their act they almost invariably stress the fact that only bigoted people and those grossly ignorant of the Catholic Church as such would register condemnation or at least disapproval of their conversion.

Let us see whether the latter point is well taken. The power of attraction in Catholicism may be traced in a threefold direction:

1. Her assumed authority in interpretation of Scripture with its attendant claim upon an exclusive comprehension of truth.

2. Her established cult as expressed in her form of worship.

3. Her organic structure as an instrument of world power. These are the three basic elements.

I.

We begin with *the attractive power* of the Catholic Church which proceeds from her *assumed authority in all matters relating to her teaching of the Bible.* This assumed and rigidly maintained authority exerts an alluring effect upon intellectually dependent individuals. The quest of man after truth is born of an innate and unquenchable desire, but the old fountains from which he has sought to quench his thirst for the truth have not satisfied him; he has turned away from them. Despite amazing progress and success science has proven itself insufficient in a final discovery of the truth and has completely disillusioned the non-scientific mind of the present generation, a profound desire for a firm footing amidst the confusing and unstable conditions has taken possession of these people and with eager eyes they are searching for the rock which the turbulent waters of doubt, uncertainty and fear may not move.

To satisfy this longing of a deeply confused and disturbed humanity the Catholic Church is pointing to her dogma of papal infallibility in matters of teaching where the zealous searcher after the trtuh is offered a guarantee of a satisfying explanation of the truth.

It might be well to remind ourselves of the definitely enunciated dogma of infallibility promulgated by the Vatican Council in 1870: "When the pope, as pastor and teacher of all peoples and by virtue of his supreme apostolic power, decrees a dogma relating to faith or morals for unconditional acceptance by the entire church, he possesses the identical infallibility with which Christ has invested His church. As a result his decisions remain unalterable in themselves." This is an apothegmatic dictum, chiseled in stone. Let us compare with it the words of a prominent convert, a highly educated deaconess in Germany, the daughter of an Evangelical professor of theology. She bitterly arraigns the religious division and dismemberment of particularistic Protestantism: "The most orthodox circles of the Protestant church to which I have belonged for more than 50 years, what do they mean to the great majority of the people to whom nothing is sacred any longer, not the Bible, nor the Symbolum nor the person of the Divine Savior! The work of undermining the very foundation of faith, which has been going on for decades, has already reached the masses in its destructive effect." While a pronouncement of such a scathing and peremptory judgment of Protestantism as rendered by the two converts quoted is one-sided and therefore unjust, yet the impression of the evident contrast between the compactly expressed claim of the Catholic church and the condition of separatism and particularism due to a vacillating interpretation of the truth in the Protestant church remains. Having arrived at an acknowledgment "in principio" of the ecclesiastical authority in teaching, it is not a far step to the justification of the so-called "fides implicita," i. e., of the enveloped (undeveloped!) faith. And the implication is as plain as it is significant: The simple-minded Catholic could not be expected to embrace with either knowledge or understanding the multitude of dogmas which the authority of the church has laid down in the course of centuries. Nor is such a requirement demanded of any Catholic believer; it is sufficient for him to believe and accept the subject matter in toto. This is done when the individual believer gives asurance that he fully believes all the holy Catholic church professes to believe.

To Evangelical believers whose conception of faith is radically different, such an attitude is altogether unacceptable.

And now, *what is our reaction?* Just why and where do Protestants differ? Why do we find ourselves at variance in an alert con-

science which refuses to capitulate before the deductions of reasoning? Because we instinctively feel that an earthly court of adjudicature—the Roman Catholic Church in the person of the pope—has usurped an authority which it does not possess, specifically the authority to dictate to conscience its own comprehension or apperceptive knowledge of the truth. No human authority, no matter how conspicuously and elaborately clothed with ecclesiastical power, is justified in dictating to others in matters relating to truth by sheer duress of conscience. The dire consequences of such a constraint of conscience are twofold; on the one hand a profligate and vicious destruction of the simple sense of truth in those who are inclined to render a "sacrificium intellectus" in the perverted notion of thereby rendering a service to God; on the other hand, an elemental rebellion of the sense of truth in those who decline the presumptuous demand in defense of their inherent right to freedom of conscience. The worst aspect, however, unfolds itself in the flagrant misuse of the gospel, as if the gospel, God's glad tidings, represented a purely human regulation in matters of faith requiring enforcement of recognition by ecclesiastical mandates. It is true that the gospel has the inherent power of conviction when it is proclaimed in the strength of the spirit of God; it is also true that the word of truth has been entrusted to the church of Jesus Christ, but the proclamation of the word does not bind the church to herself but to her Lord and Master. The church represents a spiritually equipped institution, not a judicially constituted organization with power over conscience. It is easy to understand that it is much more expedient, much more human to bow to an infallible authority of a visible church than to continuously keep one's conscience open to the invisible power of the spirit in the gospel, but by faithfully pursuing the latter course we may obtain certainty of truth and of salvation in one. As a further proof of the correctness of our contention we quote the words of a Catholic professor of theology in Innsbruck. This disciple of the sainted Ignatius Loyola concluded his dogmatic lectures by declaring: "This, gentlemen, is the teaching of the Catholic church; whether it corresponds with the truth, I do not know; everything may possibly be "totaliter aliter." This declaration is highly significant. To any Catholic doubter, however, retreat is open into the intrinsic mysticism, in which the whole dogma appears as a metaphorical presentation of the unutterable deity.

II.

Reference to the *practice of deification* leads us to the second great element in the power of attraction of the Catholic church—*her established cult as expressed in her form of worship.*

To honor the Creator is the fulfillment of man's destiny, but

man is given to all possible forms of worshiping the creature; to worship the creature instead of the Creator is the indubitable mark of all heathendom, ancient as well as modern, from the imperial cult to that of the nude. But for all that the innate desire of man to serve God cannot be rooted out by any adoration of the creature.

"In unsers Busens Reine wogt ein Streben,
Sich einem Höhern, Reinern, Unbekannten
Aus Dankbarkeit freiwillig hinzugeben,
Enträtselnd sich dem ewig Ungenannten;
Wir heissen's: Fromm sein!"—*Goethe.*

Man's ardent desire for the non-objective gives emphasis to a desire which reaches beyond the transitory into the intransitory and imperishable, beyond the comprehended into the incomprehensible. And this insatiable longing to bring the divine within the realm of human perception and comprehension has not lost its urgency in our time.

Many people in our days are again inclined to look with interest upon the alluring, terrifying, enchanting and awe-inspiring mystery behind all things—the "mysterium fascinosum et tremendum." This mystic wave of our spiritual life surely carries with it much turbid water of superstition and is, therefore, dangerous. But we cannot deny that this trend of the times to the mysterious, "to bridge the mystic gulf from God to man," (Emerson), lies deeply imbedded in man's primeval, Godward nature. Our heart shall not rest, said Augustine, "donec est in Deo."

The *cult* of the Catholic church is endeavoring to meet this trend to the mysterious. Above all it is the sacramental Christ of the eucharist, from whom a peculiar magic power emanates. "The assured presence of the Lord in the holy eucharist releasing and pouring forth healing power, such is the incomparable nature of Catholicism," says a distinguished convert, and continues, "since the death of the holy Redeemer on Calvary there is no act on earth of equally supreme significance, no moment of greater consecration than the holy eucharist, whether in silent celebration of the mass or whether in high-mass in a harmonious blending of spirit and form." In his book, "the Glory of the Catholic Church," Gisbert Menge describes the impression which the solemn climax of the mass, the transubstantiation of the host into the body and blood of Christ, creates upon the Catholic worshiper: "Transformation! The tinkling of the bell announces the sacred moment, the organ is silent, the voices of prayer are hushed, all fall upon their knees, solemn silence prevails as if all worshipers were holding their breath. The priest takes the host into his hand, emulating the example of the Savior at the Last Supper, raises his eyes to heaven, bows down and whispers, 'Hoc est enim corpus Meum,' this is My

body; 'Hic est enim calix sanguinis Mei,' this is the cup of My blood. How simple and plain these words, how great and sublime their effect: The Son of God Himself descends upon the altar." Another convert says, "In the liturgy of the mass, during the holy communion and during the silent prayer before the tabernacle the highest mystic experiences are taking place in the souls of devout Catholics. The entrance into the infinite fullness of God's being, the overpowering, exulting, self-sacrificing and consuming love of God, and finally the rapturous union with God completely extinguishes all consciousness of the ego. All affections which can fill us with awe, all joy and thrill of which the human emotion is capable, from fear and anxiety to burning desire and jubilation, are here overwhelming the soul of the Catholic—and many non-Catholics. And the splendor of such an act of veneration is so brilliant that its light obliterates any and all possible defects of Catholicism."

And now again we ask: Why do we not, why can we not agree? Why can we not agree though we are equally intensely concerned with a true worship of God in spirit and in truth?

Because we distinctly feel that the cult of the Catholic church jeopardizes the worshiping of God in spirit and truth. True worshiping of God is only possible when we are face to face with the self-glorifying revelation of the hidden God. This can be traced throughout the New Testament and is also foreshadowed in the Old Testament. We are reminded of the vision of Isaiah, of the adoration of the shepherds and the wise men, of Peter's exclamation after the miraculous draught of fishes, "Lord, depart from me for I am a sinful man," or of the praise of God and the Lamb in the Apocalypse. Only when he is overwhelmed by God's great deeds can man become detached from himself. In the Catholic cult, however, the emphasis rests no longer entirely on the act of salvation of God in Christ, on the *one* place where the Holy-One has entered into form, full of grace and mercy, without thereby surrendering anything of His holiness, where God has come close to us without encroachment on His supreme and unapproachable majesty. The emphasis is removed from the real act of salvation in Christ to the liturgical drama which is presented and to the subsequent mystical experience of this drama from Calvary to the transubstantiation in the mass. Catholics do not admit this, but it is nevertheless so. There is certain proof for this actual transfer from the acceptance of salvation in obedience of faith to the magic-mystic union with the sacramental Christ, and that is the fact which no Catholic will admit, that in this manner one's center of interest remains in one's own hypocritical devoutness. Thus the Heidelberg catechism has characterized the situation with a keen understanding of the principles involved when—in harsh language born of the heat of con-

troversy—it terms the sacrificial sacrament of the Catholic mass a "denial of the one and only sacrifice of Jesus Christ" and "a cursed idolatry."

III.

The third great phase in the attractive power of the Catholic church is to be found in *her organic structure as an instrument of world-power.*

The Catholic church stands before us as a world-power of the first rank, and as such she exerts a great influence upon men of action, men endowed with energy, men in whom the urge to political activity is predominant.

It is divinely decreed since the birth of the human race that our earthly existence be one of association based upon companionship; in fact, however, we are face to face with the intricate problems of division and separation. A silent, sinister warfare of all against all, the social, economical and racial feud, is raging amongst families, nations and races, in the midst of a pretended peace. But again we maintain that the innate desire for companionship is immune from destruction, and so the longing for this companionship, for a lasting unification of the divergent, yet homogeneous elements in the world, becomes accentuated with the increasing enlightenment of the people. The problem of creating and preserving a uniform organic, social structure is today more acute than ever. To be sure, there is no lack of "doctores subtiles" in the universal endeavor to bring about a unification in social, national, ecclesiastical and international life, but a malignant and mischievous egotism is still the insurmountable obstacle.

To realize and satisfy this longing after union and companionship amongst men the Catholic church claims to be divinely ordained and equipped; her organization, centuries old, solidly rooted, embracing the world, appears to be the one mighty agency to unite mankind. "Omnia instaurare in Christo," that was the watchword of one of her recent popes, the "una sancta catholica et apostolica ecclesia," the mystic body of Christ and at the same time a superior power in palpably visible form. It is not difficult to understand how this uniquely powerful position of the Catholic church in the world, the "greatest religious-political creation in history," as Harnack called her, again and again attracts men of statesmanlike genius and impresses students of history.

And once more we are asking: Why do we Protestants fail to agree, particularly in view of the crying need of unification and companionship?

Because we are convinced that real unity, a unity of conscience, can never be established by a factor of political power, be it ever so firmly fixed and be it ever so resplendent in the mystic luster

of the supernatural. Only the spirit of God through the word of the cross can create real unity; only insofar as this spirit has led the majesty of God to victory can there be real unity in the church of Jesus Christ. The unity of the Catholic church exists only in semblance, it is only an apparent unity, because such a unity can only be kept together with more or less coercion, since the church does not possess the right of final disposal and regulation in matters of conscience.

And again her greatest transgression is to be found in her perversion of the gospel, for the Catholic is bound to effect the substitution of the invisible head of the church, the One in whom all genuine unity is rooted, by the visible head of the ecclesiastical organization in order to enforce her claim to sovereign authority; much as Catholics take exception to this logical deduction, the pope takes the place of Christ. For that very reason the kingdom of God, which is thinkable and possible only by virtue of the inner presence of His anointed, makes its visible appearance on earth in the secular and temporal power of a militant church. We cannot accept a substitute for the supreme rule of God by which alone a divided mankind can be truly united, no matter how much she may glory in her unprecedented success as a world power. If we are truly Evangelical we are confidently looking forward to a kingdom which is not of this world. The Catholic church, however, is not the kingdom of God.

Summing up we are reaching the conclusion that the *Catholic authority in teaching* is a carnally distorted reference to the divine truth as expressed in the gospel. Her *cult* is a carnally distorted reference to the adoration flowing from the cross of Jesus. Her *organization* is a carnally distorted reference to the spiritually guaranteed unity of the church of Jesus Christ, as the body of Christ.

Each time the weight is shifted from the place where God has put it and is put elsewhere, from the word of the gospel to the infallible head of the church, from the atoning sacrifice of Jesus on the cross to its re-enactment in the celebration of the mass by the priest, from the unity of the spirit to the unity of the ecclesiastical organization. Word, cross and spirit, however, belong together. The effect of the gospel is distinguished from the effect of the Catholic church in a very definite way. The gospel makes a believer of the obedient man who is no longer concerned with his personal righteousness but who expects forgiveness solely from that which God has done for us in Christ. That is what we mean when we say, "justification through faith alone."

The entire weight is resting upon the one place where God has put it, on the fact, *Jesus Christ.* And there it must remain. "Did we in our own strength confide, our striving would be losing,

Were not the right man on our side, the man of God's own choosing;
Dost ask who that may be? Christ Jesus, it is He, Lord Sabaoth
His name,
From age to age the same, and He must win the battle."

Only as we accept the glad tidings in obedience of faith, only as we have laid hold of "the right man on our side", or rather, only as He has so completely laid hold of us that we have lost our lives to Him—only in that sense are we truly Evangelical in faith and practice and only then can we give a sufficient answer to the question: *"Why not Catholic?"* The answer is: *"Because of the Gospel."*

SHALL WE WELCOME THE NEGRO INTO THE MEMBERSHIP OF OUR CONGREGATIONS?

By W. H. Schlinkmann

If we were to put this question to the members of our congregations individually, we would find that in a great many localities most of them would answer in the affirmative, and that without hesitation. Immediately afterward, however, they would want to change their answer to "No". In the end they would, in all likelihood, shake their head and admit that they know not what to say. And yet we must find an answer to the question, for it is bobbing up in various communities and, furthermore, cannot be met with a mere shake of the head.

Various things are conspiring to change this question into a real problem. The conscience of not a few in the Christian church is disturbed and aroused in the matter. We are beginning to realize and to confess that our treatment of the Negro has been unfair and unkind, to say the least. The feeling that the Christian attitude and spirit must prevail in our relation to and treatment of other races and peoples, if we are to become true members of God's kingdom, is growing willy-nilly. Individuals, as well as congregations, in constantly increasing numbers, are being impelled by Christ's spirit and teaching seriously to consider the question, whether or not we should invite our colored brethren to share membership with us in our congregations.

Also there are the demands of the Negro leaders themselves. Trust these leaders to keep our conscience aroused with their persistent questions, claims and arguments. The term 'social equality' may be somewhat hazy in its meaning to many of us, but the Negro leaders know what they want and why they want it. There can be no equality, so they argue, unless we readily admit and welcome them into our clubs and churches and homes on equal terms. And we are making a farce of our Christianity, so they insist, if we fail to meet their demands. Some of us may adjudge their demands as silly, impertinent and untimely, to say the least. They, however, consider them but fair and just.

Ever and again we hear of congregations that are confronted by the problem of receiving colored folk into their membership. A few years ago this question arose in our congregation. A colored lady who had attended upon our services fairly regularly for a period of years applied for membership. She remarked that she had always received but courteous attention and had never been discriminated against at our church, and now wished to join the congregation officially. The matter was presented to the church council with proper and necessary explanations. To the credit of said

council—or is it to its discredit?—it can be said that the majority of its members for fear of bringing shame and reproach upon Christ's name and cause by contrary action voted in favor of recommending the colored lady for membership in our church. The congregation, however, never acted upon the application and recommendation. There was a reason for it. Said applicant, in the meantime, had visited us at the parsonage and had made this remark: "I am glad that I can join your church. I want to live among white people. I hate to associate with colored folk, for I consider myself above them." Further conversation revealed the fact that she wanted us to do the "Christian thing" where she was concerned, although she refused to surrender to Christ's spirit where her own brethren were concerned. Naturally, we did the only "Christian thing" possible under the circumstances and advised her, for the sake of her salvation, to join a congregation of colored folk. Of such congregations there are not a few in our city. Since then we have often wondered what would have happened if the question of membership of colored folk had been presented to our congregation. And what would the developments have been if favorable action would have been taken?

There is far more involved in the matter than a casual glance and cursory study will reveal. Welcome colored people into the membership and fellowship of our congregations, and what does it mean? Does that merely carry the admission with it that the Negro is our equal before God and man? I do not see how we, as Christians, can do anything else but admit, proclaim and insist that the members of other racial groups are just as good and pleasant in God's eyes as we are. And, surely, it would mean much to the spreading and building of God's kingdom if the churches of America and Europe would publicly, incessantly and sincerely make such proclamation and give ample proof of such acknowledgment and belief. But does such acknowledgment really require the opening of our church doors to the Negro?

Bear in mind that if we share membership in our churches with colored folk we do more than merely declare their equality with us. We, thereby, express our good-will towards them, and more. The good Lord knows that they are in great need of just such evidences of good-will on our part. There are innumerable signs of our ill-will. The hovels, the bodies, the veins of many black folk reveal ample proof of the white man's indifference, brutality and bestiality. East St. Louis, Illinois, still can point to signs of the terrible race riots of thirteen years ago, and the darkies of an old and proud state of our Union still can boast that "the best blood of Virginia flows in our veins." What chance has the Negro? A few years ago a number of ministers of Milwaukee

thought it their Christian duty to wait upon the district attorney with complaints concerning conditions prevailing in the colored district. The attorney, however, was not impressed. He advised, in effect, that the ministers go back to their churches and pulpits and there protest against the actions of white men, pillars in our churches, who had enticed and imported gullible Negroes from the south, because of the cheap labor they represented. Then, when there was no longer any demand for their service, they "deliberately dumped them into the lap of our fair city." "Is that Christian?" asked the irate attorney. "Is that Christian?" echo we. But must we, to prove our good-will and Christian love to our colored brethren, invite them into our churches?

If we admit them into our churches we must admit them into our clubs, our offices, our schools and our homes also. We could not do otherwise. We cannot welcome them at our church and bar them at our home. We cannot share our hymnal with them at church and refuse to share dinner with them in the home, our home or their home. We cannot ask their young people to join our Sunday schools, our young people's societies and our choirs, go hiking with our sons and daughters, and then ask them not to fall in love with our daughters or sons. And we cannot under such conditions expect our young people not to fall in love with a colored youth or maiden. Often colored folk have far more "white" blood in their veins than "colored" blood. The mulattoes, quadroons and octoroons frequently are very attractive. Their very peculiarity often but adds to their attractiveness. Opposites attract each other. *And here lies the real problem.*

"But what of it?" some one will ask, "would not many a colored man make a good husband for our daughter? And could not our sons be entirely happy with a colored girl as wife?" Certainly, why not? Ever and again we read of a white girl of good family marrying a colored man. Just as often, it must be admitted, we find that such marriages are dissolved. But let us ignore that matter for the present. Our objection to marriage between white and colored folk is based on our regard for the children, born of such a union. What about them? They are the real sufferers. Read "Souls of Black Folk," by DuBois, or like literature, and you will realize how the offspring of a union between white and black, or even tan, can and must suffer.

Only recently we heard the story of a colored man who had married a girl, cultured and beautiful. A number of children were born to them. Some of them were tan in color, but two were black as coal. In this instance it did not matter much, however, for the mother, you must know, was colored herself.—Now, the very fact that we hear the ending of this story with a sigh and smile of relief

proves that we are not unconscious of the gravity of the problem involved. Just think of the discriminations, the jibes, the affronts and the insults to which many in this Christian land, so called, are subjected, simply because they have a taint of color. We have heard of girls in St. Louis who are working in a department store as white girls, but are forced to live in the colored district because of a few drops of colored blood in their veins. And a constant source of great bitterness on the part of the Negro is the fact that he finds little sympathy and less help in his efforts to protect his daughter and sister against the wiles of the white seducer. Let us first eliminate the things that are so obviously and glaringly unjust and then consider how we might meet the more delicate phases of the problem. No good will be accomplished, rather irreparable harm will result, if we will atack the problem at the wrong end.

At the last conference of the Wisconsin District a professor from one of our leading universities appeared to lecture on the race problem. His statements were informing, his remarks stimulating, his charges were challenging, but his attitude was disagreeable. He informed us that many of the modern leaders of the Negro race demand the right and privilege for themselves and their brethren to court and marry our daughters and sisters. Not till this privilege is granted them, so we were told they regard our pronouncements as to social equality of the races as sincere and true. We could not quarrel with the good professor because of these statements, even though he joined the colored leaders in their demands. The thing that we resented was the fact that he would discourage his own daughter from marrying a Negro, but thought it only proper and Christian if we should permit our daughters or sisters to marry colored men. That his appearance, or rather his attitude, proved no benefit to the cause whatsoever is clear.

The following day—the matter had not been pre-arranged—a local colored preacher, a kindly, simple soul, attended the sessions of the conference. He was invited to make a few remarks. In simple but clear and unminced words he depicted the plight of the Negro in America and appealed to our Christian conscience for justice, sympathy and help. He did not appear with impertinence and untimely demands; he did not try to convince us of our duty with detailed arguments; he stood there as Christ would have appeared before us. He stirred our very soul, and he touched our hearts. And it is the heart rather than the mind, I dare say, that will help us to meet the problem under discussion and many similar problems.

And there is the element of time that must not be forgotten in this connection. Time can and will do wonders. Even God does not despise the use of time in the solving of our problems and diffi-

culties. The cause of the Negro is not helped, not even a little, by arrogant and untimely demands on the part of young Negro leaders or their white sponsors. "Ein gut Ding will Weile haben." This problem will be met and solved only by a process of education; and that is a slow proces. That demands patience. But patience is one virtue with which our age is not blessed. Our generation, especially the younger portion of it, is not satisfied unless it has a half dozen problems on its hands. If these are not pressing it will make them so. It must also be added that not a few of our generation make an issue of a matter prematurely and then, when the damage is done, they "get out from under," leaving it on the hands and hearts of others. Fools often enter where angels fear to tread.

That time is an ally in meeting the problem of Negro membership in our churches, is evidenced by the very pronounced tendency on the part of colored people, especially the cultured, to choose their mates from among the more light-complected. The color is disappearing. Not infrequently they who are regarded as colored folk in Chicago, for instance, leave their home, appear and are accepted as white people in New York or Baltimore or St. Louis or some other city. Time, indeed, solves many a problem.

Does this mean that we, of this generation, should do nothing in the matter but twiddle our thumbs, hope for the best and offer an occasional prayer? God forbid! We can do much. We can welcome Negro leaders as speakers in our churches and, in turn, visit them in their churches. Choirs of colored folk will welcome invitations to appear before our people; and an offering for the benefit of their own congregation is always appreciated. We should insist that colored people be given proper attention at hotels, restaurants and other public places. There must be no discrimination against them in the business world because of their color. A spirit of Christian hospitality should fill us whenever a convention of Christian colored folk is held in our city. We should protest earnestly and frequently against all acts of injustice aimed at them. In brief, let us interest ourselves sincerely in their problems, putting forth every effort to assure these, our brethren in Christ, of our sympathy, good-will and love; but let us not, at this time, make a practice of welcoming them into the membership of our churches.

MODERN CONCEPTIONS OF GOD

G. Nussmann

"There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts, or passions; of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness; the Maker, and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." In these words the first article of the famous Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (published in 1563 as a revision of the Forty-two Articles issued in 1553) expresses the belief of the great majority of orthodox Christians in their God.

Little difficulty was found by theologians to support this creed by means of "right" reason, conceived of as a merely speculative process. But reason in our day must stand test and investigation, both of history, and of science. For the latter cause the defense of such a creed will meet with serious difficulties.

Factors Involving Difficulties

It is the scientist who deals with the substance of this visible (if we include in this word all that may be perceived by human senses, and arrived at by reasoned computation) world. He analyzes its composition, searches its beginnings, studies its forces, both of the mechanical and biological kinds, and seeks to arrive at certain conclusions, which express the principles and laws to be found in the world.

The history of science reveals that for centuries there has existed a conflict between it and theology. Where theology points up to a God in the heavens, astronomy opens up the vast reaches of endless space in which there is no up or down. While once the earth has been considered the center of the universe we now know that it is but a tiny speck in the firmament.

The Bible reveals God as the creator who some 6000 years ago created the heavens and the earth in six days. But geological science has found evidence in the earth's crust that during long ages significant changes have taken place. These changes happened not only to our planet itself but may also be observed in regard to the development of life upon it.

The sciences of biology and zoology took up the study of life upon the globe. Their findings were given expression in the theory of evolution which aimed to show that through countless ages life developed from the simple to the complex. In this development the story of man is included.

It has been pointed out that science itself is in a state of evolution, that tenets to which it holds today, might, in view of a new theory, be overthrown tomorrow. Even if we concede this change-

ability, there remains enough of the findings of science to prevent the establishment of real harmony between it and the Bible.

Science deals fundamentally with phenomena. The natural sciences examine the composition, structure, conditions, and forms of physical matter. The science dealing with the observation of psychical phenomena is psychology. A certain school in the field of psychology is behaviorism. Its method of approach is the observation of the reaction of the physical organization to outward stimuli. It has great value particularly on the field of animal psychology. But according to it even "thinking" and "reasoning" are mere reactions of the human organism considered in its whole aspect of heredity and experience. Religious behavior, religious ideas, including the idea of God simply deal with respective reactions of the human organism. The behaviorist knows of no soul or spirit. The definition that God is Spirit has therefore no meaning to him.

In addition, the influence of philosophy since Kant must be taken into consideration. Kant proved—to himself conclusively—that even of physical objects we know but the appearance. They are to us phenomena. The "thing-in-itself" (Das Ding an sich) we can never know. By way of sensation, perception and conception the physical object becomes an object of thought. This is all we know. When "rational" theology attempts to apply the categories of sense perception to the thought world of religion, it errs. Schopenhauer said: "Kant's greatest merit is the distinction of the phenomenon from the thing-in-itself." Kant meant to further the cause of religion, and he made an additional attempt towards it in his "Critique of Practical Reason." The success of this attempt has been widely doubted.

Before we go on we must point to some old difficulties which were revived and enlarged during the controversies following Kant. One of them lies in the very widely assumed dualistic position which many take in the explanation of God, namely that we have God on one side, and the universe on the other, or the distinction between the supernatural and the natural. Seemingly there is no bridge from one to the other.—Another great difficulty exists in the world. These considerations have afforded a stumbling block in the way of arriving at the faith in an omnipotent, wise, and good God. As we review in the following pages the various concepts of God we shall meet repeatedly with these problems.

God Is Not

In an article which appeared in the Atlantic Monthly of June 1932 Philip E. Wentworth, a young man, tells under the caption "What College did to my Religion," how he came with the traditional faith and the intention of studying for the ministry to Harvard University, and how he lost his faith entirely. He concludes

with the words: "In so far as the colleges destroy religious faith without substituting a vital philosophy to take its place, they are turning loose upon the world young barbarians who have been freed from the discipline of the church, before they have learned to discipline themselves. Perhaps this was what one of my least orthodox Harvard professors had in mind, when he once said: 'There are only a few men in the world who have earned the right *not* to be Christians'."

One of the foremost of our intellectuals, Professor Harry Elmer Barnes declared in a recently published book "The Twilight of Christianity" that if there be any God no one has certain knowledge of him; and there is no way in which one might secure his aid.

We might quote Clarence Darrow, the famous Chicago lawyer: "Suppose we admit, for the sake of argument only, that there was a creator; that this universe was planned and made and set going. Then you have to admit, that the maker of it was bigger than the thing he created. All right, then it is necessary to have another creator, to make him; and still another creator bigger than him, and so on back through all eternity, always a bigger creator to make the next creator. And where shall we stop?" "How do you explain the universe?", the reporter asked. "I don't explain it. I don't know whether the universe has a maker or not. I can't find the ultimate. I get up to a certain point and quit.—But I don't believe the universe or anything in it had a maker." "If it hadn't been made on a plan, but just happened, how could it all move in such precise order?" the reporter queried. "I say there isn't any order about it.—We have 10,000 earthquakes a year on this earth. That doesn't look like good order. In Lisbon 70,000 people were killed in one earthquake. That looks to me like considerable disorder. It happened on a holy Sunday and many killed were in Catholic churches worshipping their God. That should have taught them that God disapproved of their going to church."

Even within the church are leaders who no longer believe in God. Rev. L. M. Birkhead, pastor of All Souls Unitarian Church of Kansas City, Mo., who was on the team of the Darrow debate in that city in 1931 said on that occasion: "We no longer believe in God; we believe in man." This movement calls itself humanism. In character it is somewhat different from the humanistic movement of the 14th and 15th centuries. At that time humanists broke with traditional philosophy and theology to emphasize human values. They turned to the ancient classics for inspiration. There are still humanists of this kind among us. Modern humanism, however, turns away from the fundamental truths of religion, from the idea of God and the belief in immortality. It too stresses hu-

man values. Goodness, truth, and beauty are the ideals to be realized in human life. Whether one thinks of universe as theistic or materialistic, the creation of a society which brings these ideals to ever greater fruition, is all-important. Faith in God has been discarded because of its dangers. Men have trusted in God rather than mastered their circumstances by knowledge and skill. They have prayed for health when they should have instituted better sanitation. They have made God responsible for making this world and hope that he will bring about a successful consummation, when all along they should have been conscious of their own responsibility and worked with all their might to make of this world a better world.

To the modern humanist there exists no conflict between science and religion. Whether one accept the mechanistic or any other world view, does not matter, religion is no direct concern to humanism. No bridge between heaven and earth is necessary.

The humanist harbors no illusion about the present world. He considers it ruthless, careless of human values. At its best it is neutral. But he is willing to wrest from it the best he can, for himself and for human society. A word of Mr. Birkhead poignantly expresses this attitude: "We no longer sing 'O for a closer walk with God!' but rather: O for a closer walk with man!" A book like Walter Lippmann's "A Preface to Morals" presents in capable and creditable manner the cause of humanism.

In the issues of "The Christian Century" from February 10th to August 24, 1932 appeared a "Conversation about God," in which three men took part, each one a specialist of his side: Henry Nelson Wieman, professor of the philosophy of religion, divinity school, University of Chicago; Douglas Clyde Macintosh, professor of systematic theology, the divinity school, Yale University; and Max Carl Otto, professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin.

Professor Otto sponsored the humanistic side. In his introductory argument he made the statement: "The position which I mean to advance is based on an affirmative faith in the non-existence of God." Just what he means by an affirmative position in regard to a negative proposition does not become quite clear. Throughout the debate Mr. Otto very ably took the position of the average humanist as outlined above. He brought out quite forcefully humanism's claim to an altruistic life, particularly in his last contribution.

But it also contains a surprise. A contrary conviction finds expression: "It seems to me of positive value to recognize the truth that in things which matter most it is well to leave something at loose ends." So it does not pay, after all, to be too affirmative! "It is important to take home to the mind, home to the heart, the enigma, man, the undisclosed secret of life, the inscrutable mys-

tery of the universe. To live under the spell of that encompassing mystery adds a unique dimension to personality." Further on Mr. Otto says: "As conscious awareness of mystery differs from mysticism, so it differs in the work it does on the inward man. It is the healing work of acknowledged ignorance in the revered presence of that which is too elusive of comprehension." Mr. Otto cannot escape God. He worships "in the revered presence."

God Is an Interaction

It is rather difficult to place Mr. Wieman into a theological category. He believes in God. But his God is denied personality, not by way of subtraction, but of addition. He is above personality, superhuman, yet not supernatural. "God is that interaction between individuals, groups, and ages, which generates and promotes the greatest possible mutuality for good."—"God like everything else in existence is a process having a distinctive pattern." He is eternal and changeless. If we understand Mr. Wieman correctly his God is a force within this universe whose function it is to tie together all individuals, groups, and ages in the universe to bring about what is usually designated as the Kingdom of God.

God works for this good even against the will of creatures, though he does not aim for it. To aim would presuppose a mind similar to the human, and God has it not. (Wieman uses the pronoun he and it for God interchangeably.) God is to him "incomparably beloved above all else," "worthful beyond all else." One can pray to this God. This prayer, if it is effective, is essentially an attitude of personality. Just how a person may pray to or communicate with something which is impersonal Mr. Wieman nowhere makes clear. Communication presupposes points of contact, but there are none. Similarly, how can one love something, adore and worship it, if it be but a "dynamic existence"? One expects that one's love be answered, that one's adoration be accepted. Or is gesture sufficient?

God Is Finite

God has limitations. This is nothing new. It was held long ago that there are limitations within his own nature. God cannot do any evil. On the other side they lie in human liberty. But Mr. Wieman approaches the matter from a different angle. He says: "The problem of evil arises only when you claim that there is an almighty and perfectly good power that controls everything. I make no such claim." So there are other powers. That there may be a devil in whom evil forces are concentrated, seems quite feasible to Mr. Wieman. "But God is that particular form of dynamic existence which brings forth whatever greatest good can be brought forth."

Some theologians, among them John Haynes Holmes, pastor of the Community Church in New York City (in the symposium "My Idea of God"), and the famous writer H. G. Wells ("God, the Invisible King") hold that evolution, the story of the unfolding and expanding of never complete organisms is pledge and proof that the whole universe is an organism. God too, is subject to evolution. He is described as struggling, failing, and beginning again, falling and rising again, thus gaining new experience. There was a time in this struggle upward, when he had been able to make man. The development continues, with the difference, however, that man has become his companion.

Somewhat similar in contention is a new theory which Professor Edgar S. Brighton ("The Problem of God" and "The Finding of God") expounds. God is limited by an aspect of his own nature, "a passive element which enters into every one of his conscious states, as sensation, instinct and impulse enter ours, and constitutes a problem for him. This element we call *The Given.*"

While Holmes, Wells, Hastings Rashdale, and we might add Wieman, assume besides the self-limitations already mentioned also limitations by outer forces and thus become pluralists (denying the essental unity of the universe), Brightman remains a monistic theist. God is all-good, as Christians have always held, but in view of the evil, never fully explained, he cannot be considered all-wise and omnipotent.

So there seems to be an eternal conflict in God's nature, a conflict in which good always obtains the upper side. God is then truly a growing God. Evil was not created by him; it is due to the Given in his nature, which he did not produce. Though God does not create evil, he is able to cure it all. A God of this nature should come very close to human nature, which, too, has a Given, which, too, must struggle. God understands it, has patience with it, brings it under his ennobling and redeeming influence and makes it truly free.

If we charge Mr. Holmes and others with pluralism, may we not here see something like dualism in God's nature? Though Brightman emphasizes the spiritual nature of God, yet he speaks of matter and physical nature as "a form of his conscious appearance," and says that "God is eternally both matter and form." We cannot follow him here.

God, the Image of Man

While the Bible states the fact that "man was made in the image of God," the Bible at the same time gives ample proof that the reverse is also true. The heathen fashioned their gods after the things as they found them in the visible world, objects in the

sky, animals, man. The language of the Bible is anthropomorphic. It attributes to God human characteristics; he thinks like man, gets angry, regrets, takes vengeance, forgives, loves. He is compared to a king, a shepherd, a husband, a potter, a husbandman, a father. The expressions in our creeds are anthropomorphic. When we ascribe to God all-goodness, all-wisdom, all-power we simply extend human qualities to him to the nth degree.

Dean Shailer Matthews, of the divinity school, University of Chicago, has taken up this thought in two recent books, and deepened and enlarged it: "The Atonement and the Social Process," and the "Growth of the Idea of God." They afford valuable reading. In the second of these books Mr. Mathews traces the growth of the idea of God from primitive times to our day. Rather than reviewing the whole field of religion he enters after a brief chapter on primitive religion, the realm of the Bible and continues to use the history of Western Christianity as the field from which he draws his material for illustrating the theme. This may be described as follows. Figures of speech: "The Lord is my fortress," "I am the vine," express likenes. But men are not entirely satisfied with comparisons. They desire to know not what God is *like* but what he *is*. So the metaphor grows into a statement of religious fact. "The Lord is my shepherd" does not merely draw a parallel, but clothes the idea of God with a definite content which expresses more than the mere idea "shepherd". Mr. Matthews calls such comparisons "patterns" and claims that their origin is to be sought in social experience. The concept of God among the Hebrews travelling through the wilderness was that of a supreme tribal chieftain. To Amos, who saw so much of debauchery and social injustice God was a righteous judge and avenger of evil. The people in the captivity had to learn that their God was not limited to the borders of Palestine but was God everywhere. Mr. Mathews unrolls one picture after another until he comes to our own day in the chapter "A Contemporary God." Just as other objects, so may science and philosophy furnish patterns for the idea of God. But never could science depersonalize the universe as long as man will remain conscious of the fact that it produced him, and as long as he will hold to the truth that personality affords the greatest value in the world.

Mr. Mathews deals only casually with evil. There were destructive forces in nature before sentient creatures evolved. Suffering appeared when forms came into existence which were superior to the physical forms. Inimical elements must be treated as unavoidable. In them personalities must find self-expression and growth. This can be done so much more effectively, since our idea of God is our conception of personality producing activity within our environment."

While one may offer objections to interpretations and conclusions which Mr. Mathews expresses, we must as a whole concede that in the matter of arriving at conceptions of God we are steeped in anthropomorphisms. "We see in a mirror, darkly." But we may comfort ourselves with the fact that no other field of observation makes any exception, not even science and philosophy. And after all, is it not better to conceive of God in terms of human personality, than in terms of mechanical force!

God Is Immanent

Some 27 years ago Professor Borden P. Bowne wrote a book on "The Immanence of God," in which he attempted to show how much in creed and practice historical Christianity overlooked a deep truth. It had kept alive an ancient dualism, which emphasized the aloofness of God and the world. To bring men to a renewed realization of the truth, that "in God we live and move and have our being" he wrote his book. A present counterpart is a book written by Edwin Lewis, professor of systematic theology and philosophy of religion in Drew University: "God and Ourselves" with the subtitle: "A Plea for the Reality, Adequacy, and Availability of God." It is a treasure house, a book which one should read again and again. He deals with the fundamentals of religion and draws upon a vast store. God is everywhere, in the house of sin, and, in a different sense, in the heart of an innocent maiden; in the fire that destroys the work of man's hands, and in the ministrations of human hands after the fire. He is in the sinner as a force of destruction and as a salvation unto life.

In chapter III he deals with the problem of evil under the heading "The Inevitabilities of Life." It might be called an exposition of Paul's word: "For God hath shut up all unto disobedience, that he might have mercy upon all," though Mr. Lewis does not allude to this passage.

We have mentioned two of the participants in the "Conversation about God" published in the Christian Century. The third might be brought to notice in this connection, though it is done somewhat hesitatingly, Professor Douglas Clyde Mackintosh. We do not wish to recapitulate his entire argument at this time. But he strikes a very important note when he approaches the idea of God from the moral point of view. "A typical instance of religious achievement through the right adjustment, making religious knowledge possible in the form of theological law, is moral conversion through a decisive act of faith." He deplores that in our day more emphasis is laid on religious education than on personal evangelism. The transformation of the human individual and the possibility of the transformation of society are the best proofs of God's existence

and character. "There is a dependable Factor delivering from evil on condition of adjustment specified, and this Factor, thus scientifically known, is God in the sense defined."

"All roads lead to Rome." And there may be countless ways which may lead to God. But they all must somehow converge in the one, expressed by Jesus:

"Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."

That pertains as much to the theologian and the philosopher as to the common man. With the new heart, which God alone can give, he also supplies the new sense, by which many may see him. And one who has seen, becomes a witness.

There are countless forces of evil in the world. There are men who openly deny God, and there are worse men, who profess his name and deny his power in their lives. Yet we need not be discouraged. Wieman is right when he assumes Interaction and Mutuality at work in the world, although we express this by speaking of God as the Father of Christ. Russia may legislate him out of the country, atheists deny him, the prophet's word will yet come true: "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea." But this will not take place until his followers will have learned from Jesus to pray and to live: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to accomplish his work."

Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in der Ehe.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

Auf die Differenzierung der Geschlechter folgt ihre Verbindung und zwar als sittliche in der Gestalt der Ehe. Ueber die **geschichtliche Entstehung der Ehe** gehen die Meinungen in der modernen Forschung sehr weit auseinander. Die einen nehmen am Anfang der Geschichte einen vollkommen regellosen Geschlechtsverkehr, absolute Promiskuität an; sie glauben, daß der auf allen Gebieten bestehende Kommunismus gerade auch auf geschlechtlichem Gebiet geherrscht habe. Diese Meinung wird von einer ganzen Reihe von neueren Ethnologen und besonders auch von der sozialistischen Literatur vertreten. Die Gesellschaft soll nicht ein Produkt der Familie, sondern umgekehrt die Familie erst eine Schöpfung der Gemeinschaft sein. Eine spezielle Form dieser These ist die Behauptung von der ursprünglichen Herrschaft des sogenannten Mutterrechtes, des Matriarchates, bei dem der Zusammenhang der Kinder nur nach ihrer Abstammung von einer Mutter bestimmt wurde. Bloch, der ganz von dieser Anschauung überzeugt ist, drückt sie aber doch in einer Form aus, die ihre historisch-exakte Begründung recht zweifelhaft macht: „daß vor der Monogamie Polygamie oder gar ein der Promiskuität ähnlicher Zustand existiert hat, ist sehr wahrscheinlich und sogar ‚a priori' anzunehmen." In der Tat dürfte bei dieser Behauptung **„das ‚a priori' annehmen"** d. h. die spekulative Konstruktion, die Zurückdatierung des eigenen Ideales in den Ur- und Naturzustand — das ist besonders bei den Sozialisten der Fall — eine sehr weitgehende Rolle spielen. Denn auf der andern Seite haben moderne Ethnologen das Gegenteil behauptet, vor allen Dingen der Engländer Westermark in dem ausführlichsten Werk: „Geschichte der menschlichen Ehe." Infolgedessen meinte der kürzlich verstorbene bekannte Schweizer Forscher Forel: „Die auch von modernen Autoren geteilte Annahme der Promiskuität (Geschlechtliche Gemeinschaft von Männern und Weibern ohne Ehe) ist grundfalsch und wird von Westermark an Hand eines erdrückenden Tatsachenmaterials erschöpfend widerlegt." Besonders entschieden ist die Stellungnahme Wundts, des früheren Leipziger Philosophen, vom völkerpsychologischen Standpunkt: „Als Ausgangspunkt für die Bildung der in der späteren Kultur auftretenden mannigfachen Eheformen und Familienverbände erweist sich, wo immer bis jetzt relative Anfangszustände der Beobachtung zugänglich gewesen sind, die monogamische Ehe und die auf ihr ruhende Einzelfamilie als ursprünglich. Demnach darf man wohl annehmen, daß die monogamische Ehe nicht erst ein Erzeug-

nis der Kultur, sondern daß sie im Gegenteil diejenige Form sexueller Verbindung ist, die der Mensch aus seinem Naturzustand in die Anfänge seiner Kultur mitgebracht hat; wie denn auch unter den dem Menschen am nächsten stehenden Anthropoiden der Gorilla und wahrscheinlich auch der Schimpanse in monogamischer Ehe leben. Die Polygamie in ihren beiden Formen, der vorzugsweise unter diesem Namen bezeichneten und der in primitiveren Zuständen zuweilen neben ihr, selten nur allein bestehenden Polyandrie, ist dagegen eine Abweichung, die offenbar überall erst unter dem Einfluß gewisser Kulturbedingungen eingetreten ist, die freilich selbst einer relativ zurückgebliebenen Stufe angehören, indes die höhere Kultur überall wieder der monogamischen Einzelehe sich zuwendet." — Ist es **demnach sehr wahrscheinlich, daß an den Anfängen menschlicher Gemeinschaft schon die monogamische Ehe bestanden hat,** so darf diese doch nicht mit der gleichen Exklusivität und all den Merkmalen gedacht werden, die wir ihr heutzutage als ethischem Ideal beilegen. Durch den Nachweis des natürlichen Charakters der monogamischen Ehe wird zunächst nur eine solche Behauptung, wie die Blochs widerlegt, daß sie vom „rein anthropologischen Standpunkt ein künstliches Gebilde sei." Auch die **moralstatistische Beobachtung** von dem sich wesentlich gleichbleibenden, zahlenmäßigen Verhältnis der Geschlechter — eine etwas größere Geburtszahl von Knaben wird durch deren größere Sterblichkeit so herabgemindert, daß ein kleiner Ueberschuß von Frauen in heiratsfähigem Alter vorhanden ist, dem dann in höheren Jahren eine fast vollständige Gleichheit beider Geschlechter folgt — spricht auch dafür, daß das „Natürliche" nur die Geschlechtsbeziehung zweier menschlicher Wesen zueinander ist.

Wie immer es aber auch mit der natürlichen Urform der Geschlechtsgemeinschaft gestanden haben mag, so ist deren gegenwärtige sittliche Form durch die Geschichte bestimmt und vor allen Dingen durch die **israelitisch-christliche Idealbildung.** Im Judentum bestand als Ideal die lebenslängliche Monogamie, wie sich das besonders deutlich in der Schöpfungsgeschichte ausgesprochen findet. Daneben war bei Kinderlosigkeit in der Helden- und Patriarchenzeit auch eine begrenzte Polygamie gestattet. Innerhalb der Ehe fiel das Hauptgewicht auf die Fortpflanzung des Volkes, wie auf die wirtschaftliche Gemeinschaft. Das Lob der tugendsamen Hausfrau in den Sprüchen Salomons wie bei Jesus Sirach gilt vor allen Dingen der Mutter und der wirtschaftlich tüchtigen Frau. Kann man zwar nicht von einer Knechtung der Frau in der jüdischen Ehe reden, so hat der Mann doch entschieden das Uebergewicht, wie besonders die Bestimmungen über die Ehescheidung und deren Ausführung deutlich machen. Diese alttestamentlichen Anschauungen ha-

ben auf das Christentum und auch noch die modernen Anschauungen stark gewirkt. „Der Einfluß der alttestamentlichen, der — theokratisch gemilderten Patriarchalismus mit stimmungsvoller Innigkeit verbindenden — Aussprüche auf die gefühlmäßige Gestaltung der modernen Ehe ist durch Vermittlung der christlichen Predigten und der Bibellektüre, namentlich nach der Reformation, ein zweifellos außerordentlich bedeutender gewesen." (Marianne Weber.)

Jesus selbst tritt mit aller Bestimmtheit für die Ehe ein und zwar in monogamischer Unauflösbarkeit. Er sieht in den vom Alten Testament zugelassenen Ausnahmen nur Konzessionen, die um der Herzenshärtigkeit der Menschen willen gemacht sind, aber dem eigentlichen Schöpferwillen widersprechen. Er fühlt sich darum auch nicht als erstmaliger Stifter der Ehe, begründet diese auch durchaus nicht auf religiöse Prinzipien, sondern sieht in ihr eine durch starken Naturtrieb gegebene sinnliche Gemeinschaft: „Habt ihr nicht gelesen, daß, der im Anfang den Menschen gemacht hat, der machte, daß ein Mann und Weib sein sollte. Und er sprach: Darum wird ein Mensch Vater und Mutter verlassen und an seinem Weib hangen, und werden die zwei ein Fleisch sein. So sind sie nun nicht zwei, sondern ein Fleisch, was nun Gott zusammengefügt hat, das soll der Mensch nicht scheiden." (Matth. 19, 4—6.) Indem aber Jesus auch auf geschlechtlichem Gebiet von der äußeren Tat auf die innere Gesinnung zurückgeht, wie seine Ausführungen über das sechste Gebot in der Bergpredigt zeigen, wollte er selbstverständlich auch, daß die Ehe nicht nur eine fleischliche, sondern auch eine religiös-sittliche Gemeinschaft sei. Durch gleiche sittliche Anforderungen an Mann und Weib und durch Ablehnung der Scheidung als dem Wesen der Ehe widersprechend, machte er die Frau innerhalb der Ehe dem Mann immer ebenbürtiger.

Auch für Paulus ist die Ehe eine Gottesordnung und zwar gleichfalls in der Form einer unauflöslichen Monogamie. Er betont an ihr besonders derb und deutlich die natürlich fleischliche Seite. Weil sie ihm vor allen Dingen notwendig und wertvoll zur Vermeidung der Unzucht erscheint, wünscht er daß die Ehegatten einander die eheliche Pflicht leisten (1. Kor. 7). Aus dem Vergleich der Ehe mit dem Verhältnis Christi zu seiner Gemeinde kann man schließen, daß auch Paulus der Ehe einen höheren religiös-sittlichen Inhalt gab. Rechtlich sozial ordnet allerdings Paulus die Frau innerhalb der Ehe dem Mann und sonderlich in ihrem Verhältnis zum öffentlichen Leben entschieden unter.

„Paulus fordert — und dies ist ein Markstein in der Entwicklung der Ehemoral — ihre Unauflöslichkeit und die unbedingte Bewahrung der ehelichen Treue auch vom Mann und vergeistigt

die Eheauffassung durch den mystischen Vergleich der ehelichen Beziehung mit der Beziehung Christi zu der Gemeinde." (M. Weber.)

In der sittlichen Auffassung der Ehe steht das Christentum in der Antike nicht allein da, sondern wie Jordan vorsichtig und gerecht den Tatbestand formuliert: „Man kann sagen, daß das Christentum mit dieser Forderung der Ehe als einer sittlichen Lebensgemeinschaft in enger Berührung steht mit den Vertretern einer höchst entwickelten Auffassung in der Antike, nicht mit der antiken, ganz anders gearteten Praxis." **Aber erst durch das Christentum wurde diese Auffassung vom unauflöslichen Charakter der monogamischen Ehe das maßgebende Ideal für die gesamte abendländische Kultur,** vor allem auch Inhalt des weltlichen, wie kanonischen Rechtes. Die katholische Kirche hat der Ehe stets eine hohe Schätzung zu teil werden lassen und zwar mit starker Betonung ihrer Unauflöslichkeit. Auch sie hat ihre Naturbasis und ihre Bedeutung für die Erhaltung der Gattung mit besonderer Energie betont, ja in älterer Zeit mit großer Einseitigkeit. Augustin hat als Zweck der Ehe einzig die Erzeugung von Nachkommenschaft bezeichnet und darum jeden Geschlechtsverkehr auch in der Ehe, der diesem Zweck nicht dient, für verwerflich erklärt. Auf der andern Seite hat die katholische Kirche die Ehe der Schöpfungsordnung entnommen und der Erlösungsordnung eingefügt, indem sie aus ihr ein Sakrament machte d. h. aber zu einem Mittel des Erlösungslebens. Daraus ergab sich die bedeutsame Konsequenz, daß alle Fragen und Ordnungen der Ehe, auch die rechtlichen in die Hände der Kirche kamen. Nach katholischer Auffassung ist „in der gegenwärtigen christlichen Ordnung die Ehe-Gesetzgebung, soweit das eheliche Band selbst in Betracht kommt, Sache der Kirche. Für Christen hat also die Staatsgewalt aus sich keinerlei Jurisdiktion über die Ehe."

Die Bedeutung der Reformation für das Eheideal besteht — von der Kritik des zweiten Ideales der römischen Kirche neben und über der Ehe, der Virginität abgesehen —, **darin, daß sie ihm den übernatürlich sakramentalen Charakter genommen und als eine reine vom Schöpfer gewollte Naturordnung angesehen hat, deren nähere Regelung demgemäß den verschiedenen natürlichen Gemeinschaften zukommt.** Luther hat in sehr derben, an Paulus und Augustin anknüpfenden Aeußerungen die Ehe als ein Institut zum Zweck der Geschlechtsbefriedigung und der Kindererzeugung bezeichnet. Seine Betrachtungsweise ist — wobei allerdings zu ihrer Beurteilung Sprach- und Denkweise seiner ganzen Zeit herangezogen werden muß — eine recht realistische, fast naturalistische. Der Erlanger Lutheraner Hofmann bemerkte mit einer gerade für sein echtes, nicht sklavisches Luthertum charakteristischen Freimütigkeit: „Anfangs

freilich trat Luther zu stark auf die entgegengesetzte Seite. Er hat anfangs das Natürliche des geschlechtlichen Lebens so stark hervorgehoben, daß die Heiligkeit des Ehestandes selbst dadurch gefährdet werden konnte. Aber es konnte eben nur so scheinen. In Wahrheit hat er eben nur das, was nach der Schöpfungsordnung natürliches Recht ist, wieder ans Licht gezogen." **In der Tat hat Luther in packender Weise miteinander die natürliche und echtreligiöse Betrachtungsweise geeint.** So äußert er sich über die Anziehung der Geschlechter einmal mit den Worten: „Lieber Knabe, schäme du dich nicht, daß du eines Mägdleins begehrest und das Mägdlein eines Knaben begehret; laß es nur zur Ehe gelangen, nicht zur Büberei, so ist das keine Schand, so wenig als Essen und Trinken eine Schande ist." — „Es ist ein christlich und gottselig Ding, daß du eine Jungfrau lieb habest, die du mit Ehren zum Weib haben mögest. Denn solches ist eine natürliche Neigung, so Manns- und Weibsbilder eines zum andern haben. Denn Gott will nicht haben, daß man diese Neigung verachten soll, als ob sie an sich unehrlich wäre." Mit vollem Wirklichkeitssinn erkennt Luther in einer frühen Ehe einen besondern Schutz wider Unsittlichkeiten und empfiehlt mit seinem starken Providenzglauben Gott auch das Fortkommen der aus ihr entstehenden Kindern: „Darum zu beschließen, wer sich nicht findet geschickt zur Keuschheit, der tue beizeiten dazu, daß er etwas schaffe und zu arbeiten habe und wage es danach in Gottes Namen und greife zur Ehe. Ein Knabe aufs Längste, wenn er zwanzig, ein Mägdlein wenn es fünfzehn oder achtzehn Jahre ist. So sind sie noch gesund und geschickt und lassen Gott sorgen, wie sie mit ihren Kindern ernährt werden. Gott macht Kinder, der wird sie auch wohl ernähren." Auch die Lasten des Ehestandes preist Luther „als hohe Werke, mit göttlichem Wohlgefallen als mit köstlichem Gold und Edelsteinen geziert. Also soll man auch ein Weib trösten und stärken in Kindesnöten und also sagen: Gedenke, liebe Greta, daß du ein Weib bist und dies Werk Gott an dir gefällt. Tröste dich seines Willens fröhlich, stirbst du darüber, so fahre hin und wohl dir. Denn du stirbst eigentlich in edelm Werk und Gehorsam Gottes. Ja wenn du nicht ein Weib wärest, so solltest du jetzt allein um dieses Werkes willen wünschen, daß du ein Weib wärest und so köstlich in Gottes Werk und Willen leiden und sterben."

So vertieft Luther Ehe und eheliches Leben; allerdings moderne Romantik und individualistische Seelenverfeinerung liegt ihm ganz fern. Er zeichnet den Typus einen gut bürgerlichen und bäuerlichen Ehe und hat diese auch persönlich vorgelebt. Der dreiundvierzigjährige Mann hat nicht aus der sogenannten großen Liebe heraus geheiratet, sondern vor allen Dingen, um seine Lehre durch

sein Leben zu bekräftigen. Er hat dann eine sittlich unanstößige Ehe geführt, die aber einen durchaus nüchternen Charakter trug, wenn es auch nicht an sittlich-religiöser Verklärung und Innerlichkeit fehlte. Auch darin stand Luther auf altchristlichem Standpunkt, daß in der Ehe der Mann maßgebend sein sollte, obwohl ihm sein „Herr Käthe" die Wahrung und Durchführung dieses Standpunktes durchaus nicht immer leicht machte. Dieser persönlichen Einstellung Luthers entsprechen auch die **offiziellen Aussagen der protestantischen Bekenntnisse über die Ehe.** So betont Aug. 23: „Gott selbst hat den Ehestand eingesetzt, menschlicher Gebrechlichkeit zu helfen und Unzucht zu wehren." Apol. 23 heißt es: „Und das ist Gottes Geschöpf und Ordnung, daß der Mann zum Weib geneigt sei, das Weib zum Mann. Ist es natürlich Recht, so ist es Gottes Ordnung, also auch göttlich Recht. Der Ehestand von Christgläubigen ist ein reiner und heiliger Stand, denn er ist ja geheiligt durch Gottes Wort." Bei der lutherischen Anschauung der Ehe mußte die Schwedin E. Key, trotz ihrer modern-kritischen Stellungnahme doch anerkennen: „Der lutherischen Kirche ist es allerdings gelungen, das Verantwortlichkeitsgefühl zu entwickeln, nicht aber die Liebe."

Die moderne Entwicklung hat nur in sofern einen Fortschritt gebracht, als sie das persönlich geistige und individuelle Element im ehelichen Verhältnis stärker unterstrichen hat. „Die Individualisierung der Liebe ist wesentlich ein Produkt der neueren Zeit." Sie hängt ihrerseits wieder ab von der geistigen Hebung der Frau. Infolgedessen erscheint gegenwärtig die Ehe auch als Selbstzweck durch die Stiftung innerster Gemeinschaft zwischen zwei einander verstehenden Persönlichkeiten, nicht bloß als Gattungszweck zur Erzeugung neuer Generationen. Das alles sind Vertiefungen und Verfeinerungen, die sich ohne Schwierigkeiten in das Ideal der monogamischen Ehe auch in ihrer christlich — reformatorischen Bestimmtheit einfügen lassen. Ein wenig einseitig ist darum noch die Bestimmung, die der Berliner praktische Theologe, Mahling, der Ehe gibt: „Die Vereinigung der beiden Geschlechter dient der Erhaltung und Fortpflanzung der Gattung. Als geistige Wesen, in Liebe verbunden, dienen so die beiden Menschen dem dritten, dem Kind." Umfassender hat sie schon die erste neuere lutherische Ethik im 19. Jahrhundert von A. v. Harleß verstanden: „Namentlich ist Kindererzeugung nicht als Zweck ehelicher Gemeinschaft so zu nennen, als wäre Ehe und eheliche Gemeinschaft außerhalb der Erreichung dieses Zweckes gottwidrig." Das Gesamturteil über die christliche Ehe hat eine der modernsten und bedeutensten Frauen Marianne Weber in den Satz zusammengefaßt: **„Ein ethisch höheres Ideal, als die mit der Absicht auf Dauer und Ausschließlichkeit geschlossene**

monogame Ehe ist bis heute unbekannt. Man zeige uns ein höheres Ideal — dann erst werden wir das alte zu den Toten legen.“

Aus dem christlichen Eheideal ergeben sich eine Reihe sittlicher Forderungen für die Schließung, Trennung und Führung der Ehe wie der Ehelosigkeit. Wir fassen — um nicht zu ausführlich zu werden — unsre Meinung in knappe Thesen zusammen.

I.

Vorbedingung der Ehe ist neben der sexuellen Anziehung eine geistige, besonders auch sittlich-religiöse Uebereinstimmung oder mindestens die Möglichkeit einer solchen. Ihrer Erprobung soll die **Verlobung** dienen, deren Auflösung bei negativem Ergebnis kein Unrecht, sondern im Gegenteil sittliche Pflicht ist, um eine unsittliche Ehe zu vermeiden. Vom **Eheschluß** selbst gilt nicht nur rechtlich, sondern auch ethisch: „mutuus consensus facit matrimonium.“

Diese Uebereinstimmung konstatiert nur die **standesamtliche Trauung** und gibt ihr die rechtlichen Folgerungen. Als reiner Rechtsakt kommt die Ziviltrauung dem Staat zu und bedeutet diese eine Entlastung für die **kirchliche Handlung,** die rein religiös-seelsorgerlich die freiwillig erbetene Segnung für den spezifisch christlichen Ehestand vermittelt. Festlegung der rechtlichen **Ehehindernisse** ist gleichfalls Sache des Staates, während die Kirche unabhängig davon noch weitere sittlich-religiöse Bedenken gegen eine Trauung erheben kann.

II.

Aus dem monogamen und unauflöslichen Eheideal folgt als einzig mögliche **Trennungsform** der Tod. Da die Ehe nur für das irdische Leben bestimmt ist (Matth. 22, 30) ist Wiederverheiratung ethisch durchaus zulässig (1. Tim. 5, 14). Rein sittliche Scheidungsgründe kennt das christliche Eheideal nicht, da selbst Ehebruch durch Buße und Vergebung gesühnt werden kann und soll. Aus dieser innerlich christlichen Haltung darf jedoch kein Zwang für alle Nichtchristen und Namenschristen werden, sodaß die staatliche Gesetzgebung verschiedene Scheidungsgründe zulassen kann und die besondre Erschwerung der Scheidung von zweifelhaftem ethischen Wert beim Fehlen christlicher Motive und Kräfte ist.

III.

Die **Führung der Ehe** hat ihrem geist-leiblichen Wesen zu entsprechen und sonderlich in ihr die opferwillige Liebe zu verwirklichen. Natürliche Versagung der Nachkommenschaft ist als Schickung zu ertragen, künstliche Verhinderung (Neumalthusianismus) im Interesse der Gattung und der natürlichen Weihe des Geschlechtsverkehrs sittlich sehr bedenklich.

IV.

Ist die aus der Geschlechtsgemeinschaft erwachsene **Familie** zunächst ein rein natürliches Gebilde, so ist sie doch zugleich die Elementarschule sittlich-sozialer Betätigung in der Ethisierung des Verhältnisses von Ungleichen d. h. von Eltern und Kindern, älteren und jüngeren Geschwistern, Herrschaft und Hausangestellten. Infolgedessen hat das Christentum — besonders das reformatorische — die Familie und von ihr aus die umfassenderen sozialen Gemeinschaften zu versittlichen gesucht und die gerade in der modernen Zeit einsetzenden schädigenden Einflüsse aufs Stärkste bekämpft.

Va.

Neben das Eheideal tritt wie häufig in der Religions- und Kulturgeschichte so auch im Urchristentum das der **Ehelosigkeit.** Jesus verlangt eine Zurückstellung der Familie um des Reiches Gottes willen und hält einen freiwilligen Verzicht auf die Ehe aus diesen Motiven — wie bei sich selbst —, aber auch aus natürlicher Anlage oder besonderem Schicksal für durchaus sittlich (Joh. 2, 4; Mark. 3, 33; Matth. 10, 37; 19, 12). Paulus neigt aus ähnlichen Gründen individuell persönlich sogar zur Höherschätzung der Ehelosigkeit für die, welche die Gabe zu ihr haben (1. Kor. 7).

Vb.

Gegen die **katholische Auffassung der Virginität** als einer — besonderes Verdienst begründenden — Höherwertigkeit, die zudem durch Gelübde oder Gesetz für bestimmte Stände erzwungen werden kann, hat sich die Reformation zwar entschieden gewandt, aber das Virginitätsideal selbst in Anlehnung an Paulus (Apologie 23) durchaus anerkannt. In reformatorischer Zeit und erst im neueren Kulturprotestantismus ist dieses Ideal jedoch mit Unrecht stark zurückgedrängt oder ganz verworfen worden.

Vc.

Eine Pflicht zur Ehe besteht in den Fällen nicht, sondern im Gegenteil ein **Recht auf Ehelosigkeit,** wenn die persönliche und allgemeine religiös-sittliche Vollendung ohne Ehe ebensogut oder besser erreicht werden kann, wie in andern Gemeinschaftsformen sozialethisch unbehinderter und gesteigerter gewirkt werden kann (z. B. Diakonissen und Missionare).

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

als Künstler und Denker eine Geistesgröße?

Von Dr. C. Schieler.

Emil Ludwig macht jetzt viel von sich reden. Das soll ja notwendig sein, um berühmt zu werden! Oder nicht? Seine Schriften finden bei einem Teil des gebildeten Publikums Bewunderung, bei einem andern Tadel, berechtigten Tadel. Nun hat Emil Ludwig eine Reise nach Rom gemacht und erhielt auch Audienz bei dem machtgebietenden Diktator Mussolini, das will gewiß viel heißen. Er redete mit Mussolini über politische Tagesfragen. Zum Schluß sagte er: **Goethe und Nietzsche sind die beiden Geistesgrößen des Jahrhunderts.** Er sprach ein großes Wort gelassen aus!

Goethe verdient mit Recht den Ehrentitel, eine ganz hervorragende Größe im Reich des Geistes gewesen zu sein, in ihrer Art vielleicht einzig dastehend, man mag ihn als Dichter, Künstler, Denker, Naturforscher, als Persönlichkeit betrachten. Aber ist es berechtigt, neben diesen Mann Friedrich Nietzsche als gleichwert zu stellen und beide als die einzigen Geistesgrößen zu preisen? Ich sage: Nein! und trete im folgenden den Beweis an.

Es war einmal, noch gar nicht so lange her, eine Bewegung im Geistesleben des deutschen Volkes, die sich aber auch auf andre Kulturvölker ausdehnte: der **Nietzscheanismus.** Und auch jetzt noch erfreut sich Nietzsche großen Ansehens, will lieber sagen Beliebtheit bei manchen Gebildeten, wenn auch diese große Begeisterung für den Schöpfer des „Also sprach Zarathustra," dieses in nahezu hunderttausend Exemplaren verbreiteten Büchleins, etwas nachläßt. Wie entstand dieser Nietzscherausch? Vor allem war es das jüngere Geschlecht, welches sich für Nietzsche begeisterte. Die Gedanken, wodurch Nietzsche, der, innerlich in beständiger Häutung begriffen, schon viele Denkweisen durchlaufen hatte, zuerst größere Kreise erfaßt hat, sind besonders in seinen letzten Werken (Sammlungen von Aphorismen darf man sie nennen!) enthalten: „Also sprach Zarathustra," „Jenseits von gut und böse," „Genealogie der Moral." Er ist der Schöpfer gewisser Schlagwörter, von denen eines ganz besonders von der Jugend aufgegriffen wurde: **Umwertung aller Werte.** Alle diese alten Werte, welche uns das Christentum gebracht hat, diese höchst wertvollen Güter für das Leben der Nationen wie der Individuen, sie müssen durch neue Werte ersetzt werden. Ist das aber nicht ein Merkmal unsrer Zeit, der Zeit der Gährung auf allen Gebieten, das Altbewährte zu verwerfen und nach Neuem zu suchen?

Sodann liebte Nietzsche in Aphorismen, kurzen, abgerundeten Sätzen, zu schreiben. „Es sei sein Ehrgeiz, in zehn Sätzen zu sa-

gen, was jeder andre in einem Buch sagt." (Götzendämmerung, S. 129.) Der Aphorismus, die Sentenz, in denen er als der erste unter den Deutschen Meister sei, sollen die Formen der Ewigkeit sein, meint er. Der Aphorismus isoliert den Gedanken, stellt ihn aus dem Zusammenhang mit dem Ganzen heraus, er verlangt vom Leser nicht zusammenhängendes, in ein Ganzes sich versenkendes Denken. Er trifft wie ein Pfeil. Er will anregen, zum Aufschauen zwingen, oder durch die fein geschliffene Form glänzen und überraschen. Darin besteht sein Reiz und das Gefährliche seines Reizes. So viele Leute sind abgeneigt, eine streng wissenschaftliche Abhandlung zu lesen, aber so kurze, hingeworfene Sätzlein! Diese gleichen den Blitzstrahlen, die in dunkler Wetternacht unsicher die Gegenstände erleuchten. Geistesblitze! — Daneben stelle man Goethes Schreibweise! Wie klar fließendes Wasser, folgerichtig Gedanken an Gedanken reihend, reich an lieblichen, zutreffenden Bildern! Bei Goethe die deutsche Sprache in höchster Vollendung, aber der Aphorismus ist der Stil der Dekadenz.

Die deutsche Sprache ist die biegsamste aller Sprachen der Welt. Diesen Vorzug machte sich Nietzsche zu eigen, man darf ihn einen Sprachkünstler, auch einen Sprachschöpfer nennen. Da sind die „Viel zu vielen" (die Masse der Menschen), „die autonome Herde," „Herdenmoral"; auch bildet er ganz neue Worte: „Freuden- und Leidenschaften," „Vorhaß" neben Vorliebe, „Fernstenliebe" als Gegensatz zur Nächstenliebe, usw. Viele künstlerisch erfaßte Gleichnisse und überraschende Wendungen finden wir in Nietzsches Schriften, z. B. die Zusammenstellung: „der festeste Turm und Wille," wie hier das Bild in die Bedeutung übergeht; „Ein Felsensprengendes" nennt Zarathustra seinen Willen. Ein hoher starker Wille ist „das schönste Gewächs" auf Erden; „eine ganze Landschaft erquickt sich an einem solchen Baum." „Das Kinderland," dies schöne Wort fand Nietzsche zur Bezeichnung der Menschenzukunft. Aber es gibt manche Leute, die daran Gefallen finden.

In der späteren Periode seiner schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit fällt seine Schreibart ins Barocke; das Ornament überwuchert den Gedanken. Auch das Tempo der Sätze wird rascher, erregter. In den letzten Schriften finden sich Spuren der Umnachtung seines Geistes, und besonders in seinen abscheulichen Schmähungen gegen Jesus und seine Diener kann man die Anfänge der geistigen Nacht erkennen, in die Gott ihn versinken ließ, da er sich erhoben gegen seinen „Gesalbten," Gottes eingebornen Sohn. Mögen die Nietzscheaner, die Nietzscheschwärmer-vergötterer dies auch nicht zugeben, das merkwürdige Zusammentreffen kann niemand bestreiten. Er konnte diese Schmähschrift nicht vollenden! Tatsache! Und dies ist nicht Zufall, der doch immer sich als Ausrede oder Entschuldi-

gung der Unwissenheit und Torheit erkennen läßt, sondern ein Eingreifen Gottes!

Nietzsches Lebenslauf.

Freunde Nietzsches, insbesondre seine Schwester Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche und andre Vertreterinnen des weiblichen Geschlechtes, das sich im Uebermaß für ihn begeisterte, obschon er ein ebenso großer Weiberfeind wie Schopenhauer war, haben im Uebermaß ihrer Verehrung und Liebe Züge in sein Lebensbild gebracht, die der Wirklichkeit widersprechen. Mit einer einseitigen Verherrlichung, die einer Lobhudelei gleichkommt, sollten wir uns nicht begnügen, sondern, wie in allen andern Fragen, nach der Wirklichkeit und Wahrheit forschen.

In den Jahren 1871 und 1872 erschienen zwei Schriften, geschrieben von einem jungen Professor der klassischen Philologie in Basel, deren erstere den Teil führte: **Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geist der Musik,** voll Geist und Laune, Ironie und Hohn; die andre war betitelt: David Strauß, der Bekenner und Schriftsteller, und dies sollte später heißen: **David Strauß und andre Philister,** eigentlich die Verspottung eines modernen Wortführers auf dem Gebiet der Theologie. Diese letztere Schrift erregte ein heftiges Für und Wider und seit dieser Zeit fing der Name Friedrich Nietzsche an, genannt zu werden. In rascher Folge erschienen drei weitere Stücke „unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen": Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben (oder in später beabsichtigten Ueberschrift: „Wir Historiker. Zur Krankheitsgeschichte der modernen Seele"), **Schopenhauer als Erzieher, Richard Wagner in Bayreuth.** Ein junger feuriger Geist offenbart sich in diesen Schriften, voll kühner Behauptungen. Der darstellende Autor kommt darin viel zu sehr selbst zu Wort, sein Verlangen nach großen Aufgaben, der Trieb nach höchster geistiger Macht, Verheißung seiner Zukunft, das Vorgefühl ihrer Gefahren. „Schopenhauer und Wagner" — oder mit einem Wort „Nietzsche," so bezeichnet er später selber den ganz persönlichen Charakter der beiden Schriften, die man als Sturm und Drang bewerten darf. Eine zweite Periode seines literarischen Schaffens beginnt 1878, wo er eine Sammlung von Aphorismen erscheinen ließ unter dem Titel: **Menschliches Allzumenschliches** — „ein Buch für freie Geister," eine Schrift dem Gedächtnis Voltaires zu seinem hundertjährigen Todestag gewidmet. Schriften in demselben Geist, ein zweiter Band **Menschliches Allzumenschliches** und der **Wanderer und sein Schatten** folgten in den nächsten Jahren. Nietzsche schien von sich selbst abgefallen zu sein. — Noch einmal tritt in Nietzsches Grundanschauungen eine Umwandlung ein. Sie kommt zum Durchbruch in der „fröhlichen Wissenschaft" (1882). Aber das Hauptwerk der

neuen Periode ist die merkwürdigste Schrift Nietzsches, das symbolistische Buch: **„Also sprach Zarathustra,"** entstanden 1883—1885. Dies neben der Bibel verbreitetste Buch, in alle Kultursprachen übersetzt, ist in verschiedenen durch des Autors Krankheit unterbrochenen Perioden und an verschiedenen Orten geschrieben; es umfaßt vier Teile, welche verschiedenen Geisteszustand Nietzsches verraten; die letzteren Teile zeigen bereits Spuren geistiger Umnachtung. Da er im Winter 1882—1883 in der stillen Bucht von Rapallo unweit Genua lebte, fiel ihm der ganze Zarathustra ein, vor allem Zarathustra selber, als Typus, „richtiger, er überfiel mich." Der „Zarathustra" ist **Nietzsches persönlichstes Werk,** die **Geschichte seiner innersten Erlebnisse,** seiner Freundschaften, seiner Ideale, seiner Entzückungen, seiner bittersten Enttäuschungen und Leiden, über alles erhebt sich verklärend das Bild seiner höchsten Hoffnung, seines fernsten Zieles. So charakterisiert Nietzsches Schwester den Zarathustra. Damals, „wo sein Pfad immer gefahrvoller und steiler wurde, fand er niemand mehr, der mit ihm gehen konnte; so schuf er sich selbst in der Idealgestalt des königlichen Philosophen den **vollkommenen Freund,** und ließ ihn seine höchsten und heiligsten Ziele verkünden, so schreibt sie. Und welches sind diese heiligsten Ziele? Er selber kündigt sie an: „Die Grundkonzeption des Werkes, der Ewige-Wiederkunfts-Gedanke, diese höchste Formel der Bejahung, die überhaupt erreicht werden kann, kam mir, als ich am See von Silvaplana durch die Wälder ging." „Die ganze Geschichte ist ja die Experimental-Widerlegung vom Satz der ‚sittlichen Weltordnung' — das Wichtigere ist, Zarathustra ist wahrhaftiger als sonst ein Denker. Seine Lehre, und sie allein, hat die Wahrhaftigkeit als oberste Tugend — das heißt den Gegensatz zur Feigheit des ‚Idealisten,' der vor der Realität die Flucht ergreift." So preist Nietzsche den Zarathustra, also sich selber. Und der Zarathustra verkündet als Grundwahrheit, „daß **Gott tot** ist" (I. 1). „Einst war der Frevel an Gott der höchste Frevel, **aber Gott starb,** und damit starben auch diese Freveltaten," lehrt Zarathustra-Nietzsche (Vorrede). Mögen Nietzscheaner den groben Atheismus Nietzsches, wie er im Zarathustra gepredigt wird, abzuschwächen, zu verschleiern suchen und meinen, er habe doch noch an einen Gott geglaubt, so ist das ein ganz unnützer, geradezu alberner Versuch. Und gerade dieser Atheismus Nietzsches brachte und bringt ihm noch Scharen von Verehrern ein. Allerdings kommen noch andre Lehren hinzu.

An Zarathustra reihen sich Nebenwerke an: Jenseits von Gut und Böse und die Abhandlung: Zur Genealogie der Moral mit der Unterscheidung zweier moralischer Wertsysteme. Im September 1888 unterzeichnete er das Vorwort zur **Götzendämmerung,** seiner „Philosophie in nuce," die seine freiesten Gedanken resumiert und,

wie er ironisch sagt: „radikal bis zum Verbrechen ist." Er hatte noch ein Hauptwerk geplant: **„Versuch einer Umwertung der Werte"** unter dem Titel: **Der Wille zur Macht.** Davon war indessen nur das erste Buch: **Der Antichrist** vollendet, als die Katastrophe erfolgte, die dem geistigen Schaffen Nietzsches ein Ende setzte, ein Buch voll glühenden Hasses gegen Christus.

Und doch war er der Sohn frommer, gläubiger Eltern (geb. 15. Oktober 1844 in Röcken bei Lützen). Der Vater war evangelischer Prediger; aber er verlor ihn früh, sodaß seine Erziehung in ihren Hauptteilen ihm selbst überlassen blieb und er nur ein „Surrogat väterlicher Erziehung" erhielt, „die uniformierende Disziplin einer geordneten Schule." Er meint die als vortreffliches Erziehungs- und Bildungsinstitut rühmlich bekannte Schule „Schulpforta," der er von seinem 14. bis zum 20. Lebensjahr als Zögling angehörte. Seine Universitätsstudien begann er in Bonn am Rhein, und folgte von da seinem von ihm hochverehrten Lehrer Ritschl, „damals dem ersten Philologen Deutschlands" nach Leipzig. Das zweite seinem Leben richtunggebende Ereignis war seine Berufung nach Basel als Professor der Philologie, den er auf die Empfehlung Ritschls erhielt, ehe er seine Studien durch die übliche Promotion abgeschlossen hatte. Die Leipziger Fakultät schickte dem erst 24 Jahre alten jungen Professor das Doktordiplom ohne vorausgegangene Prüfung nach. Der Glanz eines so frühen Erfolges war für ihn kein Glück. Eine Arbeitslast, zu schwer für sein Alter, türmte sich vor ihm auf. Wenn er diese auch überwältigte, so mag sie doch eine von den Quellen seiner Krankheit gewesen sein.

An dem Krieg (1871 nahm er als Krankenpfleger teil; dann stellte sich ein Augenübel ein, das, wie es sich herausstellte, auf einer Gehirnaffektion beruhte; 1876 mußte er einen Teil und zwei Jahre später alle seine Funktionen am Basler Pädagogium abgeben. Im Jahre 1880 schrieb er: „Es liegt eine schwere, schwere Last auf mir; im letzten Jahr hatte ich 118 schwere Anfallstage. Ich lebte noch, doch ohne drei Schritt weit vor mich zu sehen." — Fortan lebte er als Kranker und sein Leiden steigerte sich „in langen Jahren bis zu einem Höhepunkt habitueller Schmerzhaftigkeit."

In den Pausen der Krankheit schrieb Nietzsche seine Werke, gelegentlich, sowie der Schmerz ihn freiließ. In solchen Zeiten fühlt er sich frei, leicht, inspiriert; wie einen Tanz empfindet er das Zuströmen der Gedanken. Nachdem sich Spuren geistiger Ueberreiztheit, Verworrenheit, Umnachtung längere Zeit hie und da bei ihm gezeigt hatten, trat Januar 1889 in Turin der Wahnsinn ein. Mehr als elf Jahre nach der Zerstörung des Geistes sollte sein Körper noch der Auflösung widerstehen. Zuerst lebte er in dieser traurigen Periode in Naumburg bis zum Tod seiner Mutter, von

dieser gepflegt, dann in schwesterlicher Pflege in Weimar. Dort starb er am 25. August 1900.

Nietzsche brauchte einmal von sich ein Gleichnis: „An seinen eignen Gedanken verbrennen" — und es mag wohl sein, daß es nicht bloß ein Gleichnis für ihn ist, mehr ist, eine Wirklichkeit, der Ausdruck für einen psychologisch-chemischen Vorgang in seinem Gehirn. Seine Gedanken treffen ihn und überwältigen ihn mit plötzlicher leidenschaftlicher Erschütterung. Sich selbst charakterisierend schrieb er:

„Ja, ich weiß, woher ich stamme!
Ungesättigt gleich der Flamme
Glühe und verzehr ich mich.
Licht wird alles, was ich fasse,
Kohle alles, was ich lasse!
Flamme bin ich sicherlich!"

Und über diese Selbstcharakteristik in Versen schrieb er: „Ecce homo!" — In seinen Leiden flüchtete er in sein Phantasieleben und träumte von einer Fort- und Höherentwicklung des Menschen über seine Art hinaus und hinauf zur „Ueberart," träumte vom „Uebermenschen," redete vom Uebermenschentum.

Die Lehren Nietzsches.

„Ich lehre euch den Uebermenschen," heißt es im Zarathustra. „Der Mensch ist Etwas, das überwunden werden soll. Was habt ihr getan, ihn zu überwinden?" „Was ist der Affe für den Menschen? Ein Gelächter oder eine schmerzliche Scham. Und ebendas soll der Mensch für den Uebermenschen sein, ein Gelächter oder eine schmerzliche Scham." Das sollen wir sein? Wir, die wir es auf allen Gebieten so sehr weit gebracht haben, wir nur ein Gelächter?! Und wenn, was muß dann erst der Uebermensch Nietzsches sein? Er sucht seine Größe, seine Ueberlegenheit auf anderm, geistigen, moralischen Gebiet. Freie Geister sollen die Uebermenschen sein, frei in jeder Beziehung nach Umwertung aller Werte!

„Ihr habt den Weg vom Wurm zum Menschen gemacht, und Vieles ist in euch noch Wurm. Einst waret ihr Affen, und auch jetzt noch ist der Mensch mehr Affe als irgendein Affe. Wer aber der Weiseste von euch ist, der ist auch nur ein Zwiespalt und Zwitter von Pflanze und von Gespenst. Aber heiße ich euch zu Gespenstern oder Pflanzen werden? Seht, ich lehre euch den Uebermenschen . . . Euer Wille sage: Der Uebermensch sei der Sinn der Erde!" Also, nach Nietzsche ist die jetzige Spezies Mensch das Resultat der Entwicklung von der Pflanze zum Affen und von ihm zum Menschen. Und diese Spezies Mensch muß untergehen; aus ihr muß erstehen der Uebermensch!

Mit dem Glauben an übernatürliche Beihilfen und Kräfte hat die Abhängigkeit des Menschen aufgehört; der Mensch, der Uebermensch, ist auf sich selbst gestellt. „Die Erdregierung des Menschen im Großen hat der Mensch selber in die Hand zu nehmen, seine Allwissenheit muß über dem weiten Schicksal der Kultur mit scharfem Auge wachen." Es gibt „Niemanden mehr, dem wir Rechenschaft schuldeten als uns selbst: **die Menschheit kann von nun an durchaus mit sich anfangen, was sie will.**" — Die Gewalt seiner Rede ist nie größer, ihre Leidenschaft nie fortreißender als in den Sprüchen und Weissagungen „Zarathustras" von der „höchsten Hoffnung," von dem Menschen der Zukunft, dem neuen Morgen. — „Tausend Pfade gibt es, die noch nie gegangen sind, tausend Gesundheiten und verborgne Eilande des Lebens. Unerschöpft und unentdeckt ist immer noch Mensch und Menschen-Erde." „Ich wandle unter Menschen als den Bruchstücken der Zukunft: jener Zukunft, die ich schaue. — Euer **Kinder-Land** sollt ihr lieben — das unentdeckte, im fernsten Meer! Nach ihm heiße ich eure Segel suchen und suchen!"

Das Kinderland ist das Land der Zukunft, das Reich der freien Geister, „das Reich, wo die große **Dreifaltigkeit der Freude** herrscht." „Nur dem veredelten Menschen darf aber diese **Freiheit** des Geistes gegeben werden; ihm allein naht die **Erleichterung des Lebens**; er zuerst darf sagen, daß er um der **Freudigkeit** willen lebe und um keines weiterm Zieles willen; und in jedem andern Menschen wäre sein Wahlspruch gefährlich: **Friede um mich und ein Wohlgefallen** an allen nächsten Dingen."

In der Genealogie der Moral lehrt Nietzsche eine **doppelte Moral** ganz folgerichtig seiner Idee vom Uebermenschen. Er unterscheidet eine **Herrenmoral** und eine **Sklavenmoral**; eine Moral giltig nur für die „freien Geister," die Mächtigen, die Gewalttätigen, den „Uebermenschen." Die Moral des Christentums ist Sklavenmoral, Herdenmoral, Moral für die Menge, die Vielzuvielen. Die Summe seiner Gedanken über Moral zieht er im „Antichrist" in folgenden Sätzen: „Was ist gut? — Alles, was Gefühl der Macht, den Willen zur Macht, die Macht selbst im Menschen erhöht. Was ist schlecht? — Alles, was aus Schwäche stammt. Was ist Glück? — Das Gefühl davon, daß die Macht **wächst**, daß ein Widerstand überwunden wird. **Nicht** Zufriedenheit, sondern mehr Macht; **nicht** Friede überhaupt, sondern Krieg, **nicht** Tugend, sondern Tüchtigkeit (Tugend im Renaissance-Stil, **moralinfreie Tugend**)."

In der großen einsamen Naturumgebung von Sils Maria, „über 6000 Fuß über dem Meer und viel höher über allen menschlichen Dingen," wie Nietzsche rühmt, blitzte in seinem Geist die Erinnerung an eine der seltsamsten Lehren des Altertums auf, die

Lehre der Pythagoräer von der **ewigen Wiederkunft aller Dinge.** Und über der Gewalt, mit der ihn dieser Gedanke in jenem Augenblick traf, vergaß er ganz, daß es nur eine Erinnerung war, die ihn so mächtig bewegte. (Gerade so wie er behauptete, er habe den Gedanken des Uebermenschen „vom Weg aufgelesen," und hat ihn doch Goethe entlehnt, der es zweimal gebraucht, im Faust und in der „Zueignung," dem poetischen Vorwort zu den Gedichten. Und die Beachtung der zweiten Stelle hätte Nietzsche zu ernstem Nachdenken über alles Uebermenschentum bewegen müssen.) Aber wohl, so sagt man: nur die Art, wie er von dem Gedanken der ewigen Wiedergeburt erschüttert wurde und mit ihm rang, bis er ihn sich „einverleibt," sei neu bei ihm. Nur eine Stelle: „Ach, der Mensch kehrt ewig wieder! Der kleine Mensch kehrt ewig wieder! Allzuklein auch der Größte! — und ewige Wiederkunft auch des Kleinsten! Ach, Ekel! Ekel! Ekel!" (Also sprach Zarathustra, III.) — „Alles in derselben Reihe und Folge — und ebenso diese Spinne und dieses Mondlicht zwischen den Bäumen und ebenso dieser Augenblick und ich selber, die ewige Sanduhr des Daseins wird immer umgedreht — und du mit ihr, Stäubchen vom Staube!"

Zum Schluß noch: **Nietzsche und Christus und das Christentum!** Es widerstrebt mir, die maßlosen Schmähungen hier zu wiederholen, die Nietzsche auf Christus und das Christentum gehäuft hat. Mag er, der arme Nietzsche, das Christentum einen Fluch, „den Einen großen Fluch" nennen! Er beweist damit nur seine krasse Unkenntnis der Geschichte; das Christentum war, ist und bleibt die reichste Segensquelle der Menschheit, trotz Nietzsche! Aber das ist erklärlich, daß alle diejenigen, welche Christus und sein Werk nicht kennen, verachten, hassen, einstimmen in das Wutgeheul ihres großen Propheten und so vermehren die „Gemeinde Nietzsches!"

Den unwürdigen Verdächtigungen Nietzsches gegenüber sei nur noch hervorgehoben, daß bei Jesu und seinen Anhängern niemand, der sie kennt, den „Herdentrieb" finden wird, im Gegenteil eine aufs höchste gesteigerte Selbständigkeit gegenüber dem Geltenden und Herrschenden. Was Moral und Moralität betrifft, so hätte Nietzsche gerade in Jesu Leben die Tugenden in vollkommenstem, übermenschlichem Maße geübt finden und bewundern müssen, wenn er Jesu Leben gekannt hätte. Aber in Jesu Leben und Lehre findet jene doppelte Moral Nietzsches keinen Raum. Erhebung zu einem geistigen Leben über Sinnlichkeit und Bedürftigkeit hätte Nietzsche auch als Grundzug der Vollkommenheit in Jesu und seiner Lehre finden können. Eines allerdings hätte er hier nicht finden können: den Kultus des Selbst, den Hochmut gegen das Volk, die Verachtung der Masse. Die hätte er bei den Pharisäern finden können.

Er fand sie bei Schopenhauer, mit dem er in vieler Beziehung geistesverwandt war. Grenzenlose Verachtung des Durchschnittsmenschen, das ist der feste Punkt in allen Wandlungen Nietzsches, und das Ende: die unbedingte Verachtung aller außer Einem, der Untergang in Größenwahnsinn. Bis hierher und nicht weiter! rief ihm **Einer** zu, den er für tot erklärt, den er geschmäht und verachtet hatte, wenn auch seine unbedingten Verehrer dies nicht zugeben wollen.

Ein gründlicher Kenner Nietzsches und seiner Werke, der ihm gerecht zu werden sucht, muß doch schließlich bekennen: „Man wird sich den nicht zum Führer wählen, der stets ‚ein andrer ward, und sich selber fremd' und immer wieder ‚sich selbst entsprungen' ist. Um ein führender Geist zu sein, fehlte es Nietzsche nicht etwa an einem ‚System,' wohl aber seinen Gedanken an der festen Position." Wie die Trümmer eines großen Geistes, dem es aber an seelischem Gleichgewicht gebrach, liegen die Bruchstücke seiner Werke, liegt sein Werk in Bruchstücken vor uns: eine Philosophie in Aphorismen!

Nietzsche war ein großer Geist in seiner Art — aber keine Geistesgröße! Wenn Emil Ludwig ihn auf eine Linie mit Goethe bringt, so kennt er entweder Nietzsche oder Goethe, oder auch — beide nicht, wie er sollte!

EDITORIALS

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Fred B. Smith is one of the most impressive platform speakers we know. As one says of him, he is master of the "Concrete style" of public address. He paints a vivid picture of a situation, or tells us how men in places of leadership diagnose the ills of society. "Always you are being hurled by his relentless realism against facts as they are and challenged with the question, 'What do you intend to do about it?'"

Some time ago he gave an address to a large body of ministers on the "World Situation." It was on the whole a discouraging picture. The only department of modern life that was not confronted with perplexity was education. "Never," he said, "since the thirteenth century has there been such a renaissance of education. A state university president told me the other day as I walked over the campus with him, 'We could have 40,000 students here next year if we wanted them, but the law of the state will only permit 14,000.' In Moscow the Soviet authorities accepted only 8,000 to their university last year out of 80,000 that applied. Lawyers who write wills have given the information that in the next quarter century education will receive as much money in bequests as it has received hitherto during all the time since colleges began in America." "Meanwhile," the speaker continued, "we must admit education is not one of the assets of organized Christianity. It is increasingly irreligious. Thirty years ago at Student Conferences I used to hear prophecies of the victories for religion that would come when those students grew up. Those students have grown up, but most of them are not in the church, and the spiritual victories have not come."

That education is not only the impartation of knowledge but has to do with the whole man, should by this time be self-evident. To train the intellect alone, with the neglect of character, may produce a man twice as dangerous to society as the illiterate. And yet how little place is character education given in the public school curriculum. It seems, as a rule, to be expected only as a by-product of the teaching of history, civics, literature and similar branches. The writer recently attended the commencement exercises of a local high school. It was a grand affair, staged on a large and impressive scale. The situation would have lent itself to an emotional appeal of the highest grade. But what did these high school graduates

talk about in their orations? The first spoke about "Finding Livingstone"; another on "Optometry"; another on "Archæology"; and others on all kinds of subjects, but not once was the subject of character mentioned; not once did it enter into a speaker's mind that the school had anything to do with the development of character. Could not a boy, or girl, of high idealism have sent a thrill through the audience by stressing that virtue is more than knowledge and skill, and integrity more than riches and success?

It seems that our schools feel barred from doing much with the souls of their pupils because religion is not one of the courses of the curriculum. We naturally feel that the reconstruction of the personality is one of the objectives of *religious* training. Jesus said a man must be born again to be a member of the "Kingdom". Regeneration is the work of the Holy Spirit, conversion is the turning of man to God. The Christian religion bases all growth in goodness on a man's religious faith. He must be dominated by God if he is to do anything important in God's world. All these avenues are closed to the school because religion is excluded. It was for this reason that only a short while ago one of our contributors demanded the introduction of religious training into the public school. He himself was well aware of the difficulties with which such a plan is confronted. The future may tell us how much can be expected and done along this line. If the direct teaching of religion is altogether out of the question, ethical culture and idealism as inculcated by the study of great personalities would offer a fruitful field. It is no substitute for religion but it will not give in to materialism or be satisfied with the respectability of Mr. Babbitt.

We in the church have all the resources of religion to draw on. We have the Sunday school, catechetical instruction and the pulpit. But there has seldom been a time when the educational system followed in the Sunday school and "Instruction" has been so much under criticism. It has been said that in practice our instruction in the confirmation class is a mere handing on of the beliefs and creeds of the past. These beliefs have found their deposit in the catechism and all the preacher does in the class is explain the questions and answers of the catechism and have the scholar memorize them. This system is called "transmissive": it transmits the religious experience (or only the religious beliefs) of the past to the present age. But what we ought to do is not to be transmissive but *creative* in our religious work. In many respects our beliefs are different from the past. Our attitude towards the Bible is not that of verbal inspiration. Science has in many ways changed our conception of the world and man. This modern attitude ought to find recognition in our educational work. And not only that—

Religion is not to be taught by giving religious information, modern or ancient. It must be experienced. Our teaching in Sunday School or Confirmation Class—and in the pulpit—ought to help our pupils and hearers to make religious experiences. They ought to get an impression as to how our faith helps us in the varying situations of life, the solving of its proplems, the doing of the work of the world. The Editor has elsewhere stated that he fails to see how every step in the process of religious training can be made a personal religious experience. He is of the opinion, however, that the goal of religious training is *to find God;* that this is the basis of the moral superstructure (called Christian character) to be erected thereon; that every hour of instruction or Sunday School is to be under silent compulsion of that directive; that better methods and skill are very much to be desired; but that the one thing of paramount impression is the sincere and wholehearted consecration of the teacher, be he layman or minister.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

We call this "Pilate's question" because the governor Pontius Pilate put it to Jesus Christ, but it is a question asked by many men better than Pilate, in ancient and modern times. However, the fact that the governor asked it in the presence of him who said, "I am the Truth," invests the scene and the question with a peculiar interest.

Pilate had asked Jesus, "Art thou a king?" and Jesus had answered, "I am a king; I am come into the world to bear witness of the truth. And whosoever is of the truth, heareth my voice." To Jesus there was no more royal business than to give authoritative answers to life's great questions. Truth was to him the thing man lives by.

What is truth! replies the governor. To him it was something philosophers might quibble about. Intellectual "highbrows"—to use the modern term—might waste their time over it. Men of affairs had their eyes on more substantial and palpable things. And even if governors might in hours of leisure condescend to enter into metaphysical debate, where was there a voice in the whole history of thought that could venture more than a guess as to the nature of truth? So Pilate either as a man of business or because of the futility of the question turned a cold shoulder on the advances of this strange man before him.

That was many years ago. But the question would not down even if men like Pilate refused to consider it. Jesus had no soldiers to force the world to listen to him. But it soon became evident that ideas are stronger than swords and that the world needs

prophets more than statesmen and generals. Pilate had looked with scorn on the man from Galilee. How could he know that the followers of this humble prisoner would undermine the foundation of the Roman empire? How could it ever get beyond the threshold of his mentality that there would be men ready to die rather than to give up their hold on truth as proclaimed by this man?

Perhaps Pilate only affected to look down with disdain on the things of the mind. He was an educated man and probably knew more of Socrates and Plato than he was willing to admit. Before this Jew he would not discuss it, but with a Greek or Roman he might have acted differently. At any rate, the human mind has grappled with the inner meaning of the world surrounding him ever since it learned to think. Even today when science is so exclusively busy with the material universe, the world of the infinitely large and of the infinitesimally small, many of the leaders feel that there must be a non-material world behind the one we see and measure, a world which demands a different kind of approach than the one of the telescope and microscope.

Is there such a world? Is it presided over by a God? What kind of a God is it? Is he interested in human beings and life? What is the meaning of our aspirations, ideals, urges? Is life confined to and circumscribed within the earthly sphere, or is there another? When man dies can he continue to live or live again?

These are beyond the shadow of a doubt important questions, they have always seemed so to man and he has at all times battled to cling to them with stubborn tenacity. But is there an answer, can a man be certain about it? Today they tell us the only way to come to certainty in this respect is by *the use of the scientific method.* We must observe the facts, all the facts we can gather. Then face these facts and see what they seem to teach. If any of them seem to be in favor of the presence of a God, let us use that as a working hypothesis and see how far it may lead us. We can, of course, not expect absolute certainty. All our results are only tentative, but if even these tentative results eventuate in better, fuller living, let us be satisfied and not attempt the impossible. I read in Professor Coe's book on Christian Education the other day. It is all built on the most modern conception of education, its meaning and the way to get it. In the last chapter he sums up the result of all he has been trying to say on Christian education. He says: "Christian education is the systematic, critical examination and reconstruction of the relation between persons guided by the assumption of Jesus that persons are of infinite worth and by the hypothesis of the existence of God, the Great Valuer of persons."

I was astonished beyond measure at the meagerness and unsatisfactoriness of these conclusions, reached after such thorough

efforts by this famous writer. All we have to go on is an assumption of Jesus and the hypothesis of a God. We have to use this as a working plan and see how far we can come.

But above we stood with Pilate before Jesus and heard him say, "I came into the world to testify of the truth." Jesus was sure he had it, he didn't only assume it. The scientific method, then, is evidently not the way to certain truth. No the way to religious truth and certainty is the *way of faith and of faith only.* We have grown up in a Christian community and imbibed the "faith of the fathers." That is called the "historic faith." We took that over as a part of the heritage bequeathed to us by our forebears. It was not personal faith as yet. It became personal faith when our religious life awakened. We found God in Christ.

But had it been only a *personal* faith, confined to our own experience only; possessed by us alone, not by others, we could naturally not have maintained it. Then we came to know that it was the faith and experience of the church, of generations of Christians; that we had a cloud of witnesses around us through the centuries; that God was not only our refuge but the "dwelling place of all generations."

Our own personal faith and the faith of the church was based on God as revealed in Christ. Christ is its cornerstone, Christ its living principle. His teachings are the supreme authority for the Christian. They are contained in the Word. The Word is not of equal authority in all its parts. It is authoritative as far as it preaches Christ ("soweit es Christum treibt." Luther).

So then there is the personal faith, the faith of the church, the teachings of Christ, in which is grounded the truth of our Christian experience. The "scientific method" is good in its place, but the way of faith guided by these signposts is the way to truth and certainty.

THE SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE

It was in the summer of 1872 that the *Magazine* was started, its first editor being Rev. Bank. Among his successors we mention especially Professor Becker and Rev. L. Haas. The present editor followed Rev. Haas in 1917. While a number of other churches found themselves compelled to discontinue their theological periodicals, ours has, on the whole, received the support of a large majority of our clergy. Only in the last few years a slow decline in circulation has been noticeable, the financial depression being one cause of this decrease. To offset this untoward tendency, to regain lost ground and win a foothold even where before we were not known,

we cannot, like some of our other church papers, expect any help from the Ladies' or Men's organizations of the Synod. The only source whence such support can come is our own readers, and therefore we beg to urge them very earnestly to give us the full benefit of their cooperation.

For convenience' sake, the January number of 1033 has been chosen as the anniversary issue of the paper. It will go to everybody and make its silent appeal. But in addition to this, we ask every reader to speak a word of recommendation to some of those who are at present non-readers. We also hope that the president of the districts and of the regional conferences as well as the officers of the Synod will do all in their power to win for the *Magazine* in 1933 an open door and a fair trial.

„Unser Leben währet siebzig Jahre."

Der neunzigste Psalm verfehlt nicht, einen mächtigen Eindruck zu machen, wenn immer wir ihn lesen beim Begräbnis eines alten Mitpilgers. Majestätisch beginnt er mit den gewichtigen Worten des ersten Verses, der die Ewigkeit und Unveränderlichkeit Gottes allem irdischen Wandel gegenüberstellt. Der Mensch ist der welkenden Blume gleich, der bald wieder sinkenden Welle im reißenden Strom. Gott ist die große Tatsache, fester und dauernder als die Felsengebirge der Vorzeit.

In diesem Psalm ist ein Wort, das dem alternden Zuhörer besonders ans Herz greift: „Unser Leben währet siebzig Jahre!" Wie merkwürdig zunächst, daß schon zu des Verfassers Zeiten dies als die normale Lebenszeit angesehen wurde, vor Tausenden von Jahren. Wir lesen doch, daß Moses 120 Jahre alt wurde und Abraham 175. Daraus folgern wir oft, daß in der Vorzeit man mit andern Lebensziffern rechnete als heutzutage. Und nun kommt hier eine Stimme aus der Vorzeit, die uns sagt, daß, wenn die siebzig herankamen, man auch damals stark mit dem Ende sich vertraut machte.

Siebzig scheint dem eine lange Zeit, der in dem Frühling des Lebens sich befindet. Wer aber es hinter sich hat, der hebt die Hand mit bedeutsamer Geste und sagt: „Sie sind vergangen wie ein Rauch!" Das sind wehmütige Gedanken, und wenn die Schrift weiter nichts zu bieten hätte als uns an die Vergänglichkeit des Lebens zu erinnern, so wäre sie ein wahres, aber kein erhebendes Buch. Darin besteht aber ihr Vorzug und unsre Freude, daß sie uns auf die Gnade Gottes trauen läßt, die auch den Sünder wieder fröhlich werden heißt. „Fülle uns frühe mit deiner Gnade, so wollen wir rühmen und fröhlich sein unser Leben lang!"

Sie legt uns das Gebet auf die Lippen: „Herr, lehre uns

bedenken, daß wir sterben müssen, ... klug werden." Doch das bedeutet nicht, daß wir einander täglich ein „Memento mori!" zurufen sollen. Der Altwerdende soll nicht täglich sich vorsagen: „Unser Leben währet siebzig Jahre!" In Gustav Freitag's „Soll und Haben" hören wir von dem Auflader, der sich eingeredet hatte, daß er nicht über 50 Jahre alt werde, weil sein Vater und Großvater auch nicht die fünfzig überschritten. Es war eine fixe Idee bei ihm geworden, er nahm wirklich ab, und Sohn und Arzt sorgten sich um ihn. Durch eine List lockten sie ihn weit hinaus aufs Land, wo es sich so traf, daß er seinen 50. Geburtstag verschlief. Nachher war der Bann gebrochen. Wäre das nicht geschehen, so hätte sein Aberglaube seine physische Widerstandskraft untergraben, und er möchte wirklich den verhängnisvollen Tag nicht viel überlebt haben.

Also Verstand und Gottes Wort wollen nicht, daß wir unsre Lebenszeit kürzen durch ein pessimistisches oder krankhaftes Gemütsverhalten.

Konnte schon der Sänger des Alten Bundes sich bei aller Wahrhaftigkeit und schroffen Sündenauffassung („Das macht dein Grimm, daß wir so vergehen . . . .") doch an Gottes Gnade und Verheißung wieder aufrichten, wie viel mehr sollte das Licht des Evangeliums uns alle Finsternis erhellen.

Das ist wahr, daß uns das Ende des Lebens mehr und mehr alles Selbstvertrauens beraubt. Als wir jünger waren, konnten wir hoffen, daß die Zeit noch kommen werde, wo wir dahingehen würden „von Kraft zu Kraft" (Psalm 84). Jetzt hoffen wir nur noch, daß es gehe von Gnade zu Gnade. Im Uebrigen wohl dem, der auch dann — wenn er altgeworden — noch genug zu tun hat. Wessen Tage voll sind von Arbeit oder von Sinnen des Geistes, der sitzt an dem Brunnen des Lebens. Seine Blätter verwelken nicht, und mit Segen schmücket ihn der Regen von oben her.

Wer aber — wie jener Gottesmann — wie jener Gottesmann — dahin gebracht werden sollte, daß er nicht mehr sehen, hören, gehen oder gar sprechen könnte, **nur noch lieben,** wäre nicht auch der ein Wunder vor Gott und in den Augen der Menschen!

The Christian World

The Christian Unity League Service

An open letter to the Dean of the Theological Seminary in Virginia

By the Very Rev. William H. Nes
Dean of Christ Church Cathedral, New Orleans

My Dear Dean Rollins:

Certain resolutions, introduced at the alumni meeting, and commending the Bishops and Dean of Missouri for their participation in the recent service of the Christian Unity League, have been sent to me with the suggestion that I indicate my approval, as an alumnus, by my signature. I note with great regret that six members of the seminary faculty have signed these resolutions. Inasmuch as the signatories of these resolutions will, by any publicity attaching to them, necessarily bring the seminary into connection with their statement of opinion, and inasmuch, also, as the signatures of faculty members will by their weight further support the at least quasi-official character of the resolutions, I feel that alumni who, like myself, are in conscience unable to sign, may be permitted openly to express their dissent without seeming to be impertinent.

I regard the action of the Missouri clergy in question, however "technically legal" it may appear, as a repudiation of fundamental principles of the Anglican Church, as those principles are embodied in the Prayer Book and canon law of this Church. The Ordinal provides for the making of bishops, priests, and deacons "in the Church of God," and not merely of officials of a denomination. The implication throughout is that this is the ministerial hierarchy of the Church as a whole, and not some peculiar order of the Protestant Episcopal body, towards which that body entertains a measure of indifference. Throughout the Prayer Book in every particular the functions of the ministry are severally assigned to bishops, priests, and deacons, in accordance with the universal custom of the Catholic Church. This specification of function is categorically stated in the Offices of Instruction. In the Preface to the Ordinal the principle is affirmed without any qualification that no man shall be "suffered to execute any of the said functions" unless he has been ordained in accordance with our Ordinal or "hath had episcopal consecration or ordination." This principle the canon law applies by admitting, let us say, a Roman Catholic priest to our ministry without re-ordination; while, on the other hand, a Methodist or Presbyterian minister, for example, must be ordained both deacon and priest and must, moreover, have "become a communicant of this Church," the means thereto being Confirmation under the unqualified provisions of the rubric appended to that office.

It is clear, therefore, from its canon law, no less than from its solemn formularies of worship, that this Church officially recognizes the ministry of the Roman and Greek communions, and of the Old Catholics, as equivalent to its own, and that it does not so recognize the ministries of those bodies who have broken with the Catholic tradition.

And this is the point of the whole matter. The belief of the Church with regard to the ministry is most surely to be seen in what it does officially. Ordination is not merely a bestowal of authority to minister in the Episcopal Church any more than it is a mere confirmation of an inward call. The candidate is questioned as to his call before he is ordained, and the authority to minister in a congregation of this Church is given after he has been ordained. The solemn sentence of Ordination itself is an act by which the Church, in the power of the Holy Spirit, sets a man apart into a specified order of ministry "in the Church of God," and conveys to him the power and authority therefor. Unless the solemn words and acts of the Ordinal are regarded as devoid of moral seriousness it is plain that the Church regards a man as being, after ordination, what he was not before ordination. For this reason a Roman priest entering our ministry is not ordained because the Church regards him as being already a priest in "the Church of God." For the same reason also, when a Protestant minister enters our ministry he is ordained in order that he may be what he was not before. In the case of the Roman priest this Church regards him as competent to administer the sacraments in virtue of the ordination performed outside this communion. In the case of the Protestant minister, this Church regards him as incompetent to administer the sacraments until he has been ordained deacon and priest. And when a man comes to be ordained deacon he comes as a layman. This lay status is left in no doubt by reason of the Church's refusal to allow to him, prior to his ordination, any function other than that permitted to the laity.

The bishops of Missouri have acted as though they regarded men who are not priests as possessing a ministry equivalent to that of priests. This the Church, in its entire system and practice, flatly contradicts. They have permitted a man to celebrate the Eucharist in their Cathedral whom this Church would treat as a baptized layman if he sought admission to our ministry. There is therefore some discrepancy between the opinions of the Bishops of Missouri on the one hand and the Prayer Book and canon law of this Church on the other.

But the resolutions have something to say about charity and Christian unity. If it is uncharitable to require a man to receive Holy Orders before he exercises priestly functions, I suppose it is uncharitable—and some people think it is—to require a man to be confirmed or even baptized. From the position that all forms of Christianity are equally valid it is an easy step to the opinion that all forms of religion, or even humanism, are equally true. Such indiscriminateness proceeds not from charity but from intellectual confusion. In the case under discussion, so far as the Bishops and Dean of Missouri were concerned,

inter-communion, which is the spiritual goal of reunion, was achieved by one reckless leap. The position of this Church, insofar as it differs, for instance, from Dr. Ainslie's, was for all practical purposes abandoned from the start. It would be interesting to know whether there was any doctrinal agreement as a basis of inter-communion, and if so, what it was. Such adventures, if they were to become the official policy of this Church, would unquestionably preclude all further participation on our part in Catholic reunion, and would ultimately involve us in the dogmatic and institutional disintegration in which Protestantism now finds itself. It is significant that negotiations with the Old Catholics and the Orthodox Church have been and still are carried on, from our side, with remarkable success on the basis of our formularies; while, as this present case most glaringly exhibits, the kind of reunion the resolutions contemplate can only be carried on by an initial setting aside of those formularies.

I hope I shall not be understood as disputing the right of any persons to circulate these resolutions among the alumni, or of the faculty members to sign them—especially since in matters of ecclesiastical controversy it is evident that all parties are acting with the desire to advance Christ's Kingdom. In thus venturing publicly to express regret I do so because I believe that such resolutions, bearing upon such an issue, require from those who are unable to sign them some other rejoinder than that of silence.—*Living Church.*

A Word for the Hour

Willard C. Selleck, the President of the California Universalist Convention, said in an address on *the Depression*—in part as follows:

But the deeper, heavier shadow which lies upon our hearts just now is the business depression. The whole world is bewildered and baffled, millions of people are out of work, millions have lost property, millions are discouraged and fearful. What is the matter? Why are human affairs so terrible awry? Economists, financiers and politicians are giving their various answers; but I do not find anybody who knows it all or can indicate a complete cure for the existing social malady. The truth is that we are in the midst of one of the great crises of history, what Sir George Paish calls "a major catastrophe." Beyond question its causes have been many, and it is now evident that it will be a long, long time before it passes entirely away.

Side by side with other explanations, allow me to suggest that the problem is essentially and profoundly spiritual. Back of economic forces and tendencies, back of political alignments and realignments, back of even the World War, which was an international earthquake, there have been certain stupendous developments which have involved *the spirit of the people*, and that spirit has not been altogether good—indeed it has been, again and again, frightfully bad.

The developments to which I refer have been mainly those which have expanded and enriched the whole material side of human life on a scale and to an extent which no former age could imagine. Scientific

discoveries and mechanical inventions, chiefly, have made this result possible. So in the last two or three centuries we have produced wealth, including conveniences, comforts and luxuries, such as our ancestors never dreamed of. For almost the first time in history, we have come within sight of material goods enough to make practically all the people decently fed, clothed and housed if only these goods could be fairly distributed. We have virtually solved the problem of production, although we have *not half solved* the problem of *distribution.*

Now this great accomplishment of ample wealth production is, in itself, a grand achievement and an enormous benefit. But incidentally it has yielded, for the time being at least, two or three most evil consequences, by reason of which we are now suffering.

(1) *It has materialized life.* The vast process of what Dr. Rudolf Eucken called "externalization," which is the main characteristic of our age, has begotten everywhere an over-estimate of wealth, prosperity, physical well-being, comfort, luxury, and all the exciting indulgences which these make possible. So it has come to pass that individuals, communities and nations covet wealth, prosperity and material advantage above everything else; and think they have failed if they do not gain these; and are always striving to secure them, even at the expense of others. Thus arises competition, which is a good principle if held in restraint, but which, if pushed too far, becomes rivalry and then—on an international scale—leads to war. Hence the law of economics, which has almost become our religion today, is, *when carried to an extreme,* the chief source of our undoing. The very thing which in itself is good proves to be an evil when it is abused —a truth which applies not to wealth only but to nearly everything else.

You see, then, that the *over-development of the whole material side of life,* made possible by modern science, invention, enterprise, organizing skill, and nature's marvelous resources, has led to a distraught condition of society throughout the world; has filled life for us all with undue stress and strain, anxiety and conflict, struggle and sorrow, instead of peace and happiness. Jesus said, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." But we haven't believed him, and we don't believe him yet. Nevertheless his word is eternally true, and Nature now, or Nature's God, is trying through our present ordeals to drive this lesson home into our minds and hearts. Herein is a true cue for the teachers of religion today.

In confirmation of this thought let me quote the words of Mr. S. R. Logan, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Wenetka, Illinois, in a recent number of the magazine *Religious Education:* "Each individual and mankind must adapt to a suddenly new world, a world characterized by distraction, fractionalism and flurry. The war paroxysm and our present economic and political paralysis are damning evidence of *inadequate vision and purpose* in the *collective life.* The rapid increase of insanity is indicative of disorganization and destructive conflict within individuals under stress of the runaway

centrifugal forces of this high speed era. Individuals, groups, nations, the human race, suffer the pains of distraction and disorganization. Without vision both persons and peoples perish." (February, 1932.)

(2) Another form of this prodigious evil of social and spiritual dislocation is *the inequality and injustice prevailing in the distribution of wealth and its benefits.* Governor Pinchot of Pennsylvania, in an article in the January *Survey Graphic*, gives figures from the Federal Trade Commission of the United States Senate and from the Treasury Department showing the following facts: That in 1926 one per cent of the people owned about 60 per cent of all the wealth; that 13 per cent of the people owned more than 90 per cent of the wealth; that 77 per cent of the people owned only 5 per cent of the wealth; that four and a half thousand people received that year an average of almost $240,000 apiece, while forty-four million people had incomes of about one thousand dollars each; and that in the eight-year period between 1920 and 1928, while the total national income increased less than 10 per cent, the number of men with incomes of over a million dollars increased over 1400 per cent, or one hundred and forty times as fast. And the amount of money these men made in one year increased 1300 per cent, or one hundred and thirty times as fast as the total amount of money made by everybody in the whole of the United States.

These figures correspond substantially with those published by Mrs. Daisy Worcester a few years ago. They indicate a glaring inequality in the distribution of wealth, and this inequality is not diminishing but increasing year by year.

(3) Now all this, with much more that might be adduced, clearly shows that we are living an unbalanced life and have an unbalanced civilization; and this is our great trouble. Such a huge disparity in the division of the material benefits of modern progress amounts to gross injustice; and no society on earth can be permanently stable and prosperous if these conditions prevail. For this is a moral universe, and we can not flout the moral law or ignore moral considerations without coming to grief. And we *have* come to grief, widespread and appalling, with our millions of idle men roaming the country, millions of innocent people suffering privation and hardship because of the follies or iniquities of others, depressed values of property everywhere, paralysis of business, and utter confusion and lack of confidence all about us.

Now while everybody realizes these dire results, only a few realize that the existing social malady is essentially of a spiritual nature—that our over-estimate of wealth and luxury, coming in with the flood-tide of modern material development, has made us love prosperity above every else, created an inordinate desire to "get rich quick," to "get something for nothing," led to a speculative fever in the souls of myriads of inexperienced persons, and produced an army of crooks and criminals who have sought to thrive by all this unholy business through exploiting dishonest schemes and manipulating finance and legislation and even court proceedings to accomplish their nefarious

ends. What wonder that public confidence is shaken when such disclosures are being made as recent months have witnessed? Defalcations, embezzlements, deceptions, intrigues, corruptions, on a gigantic scale, in our own country and abroad, to say nothing of war-making aggressions on the part of some of the nations—how can these fail to rock our civilization to its very base? And the deepest source of all these evils is a wrong spirit in the minds and hearts of the people—the spirit of greed and speed, the excessive love of gain, the materialization of life. And what we ought now to see is that the sure law of retribution is working to correct these evils by breaking the power of this spirit, and calling men back to sanity and honesty and simplicity.

We have been living an unbalanced life in an unbalanced civilization. Our material and intellectual progress has run far ahead of our moral and spiritual progress. And it is the supreme task of religion to help bring up the latter side of the development of the race. Unless this can be done, the world will go to smash. For righteousness is still the foundation of the social order, and its law is everlasting.

Religion today, then, must be profoundly ethical, having much of the spirit of the old Israelitish prophets, Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah. It must promote an intelligent understanding of economic and social facts; it must urge with all its power the validity of the moral law, denouncing iniquity and pleading for justice; and it must call men to simplicity and sanity, to moderation and mutuality in the gaining and use of wealth. Of course, wealth in itself is a great good; it is only its wrongful pursuit or use that is an evil. I am not disparaging property and prosperity, but am condemning the spirit of greed and rapacity which abuses them, and pleading for honesty, fair-dealing and a larger measure of equality in seeking them. There is really no subject in the whole domain of practical life on which the rank and file of the people more need to be rightly educated than the proper estimate of wealth. It is because so many millions have been full of false ideas and ideals about this, and have gone crazy over it, that they have built up a social-economic structure in modern civilization which is now crumbling to earth.

But our civilization will right itself, like a giant ship pitching and tossing and careening in a storm at sea. The eternal laws will hold; "they are done in truth and uprightness; they stand fast forever and ever." The follies and sins of men will bring disaster, and the innocent may suffer with the guilty, but the Divine government of the universe can not be overthrown. Our trials and tribulations will lead at last, through evolution or revolution, to a juster social order than that which now prevails. The Spirit of Righteousness must ultimately triumph. It is for you and me to help it triumph by letting it have its perfect work in our own lives.—*The Christian Leader.*

Lausanne's Moral Challenging to America

Roland Hall Sharp

American action on war debts during the next year will do more than to determine in large measure the pace of world economic recovery. It will show where America stands in face of something higher that is already a tradition in Europe—"The Spirit of Lausanne."

From the economic side, no action or lack of action on America's part can materially change the amount of war debt repayment. Europe can pay only so much whether America insists on all or agrees to take part.

A similar situation confronted European nations when they met at the Lausanne Reparations Conference. Germany's capacity to pay was too low for any one to consider insisting upon full repayment under the Young Plan. The triumph of Lausanne was therefore not the scaling down of reparations to $714,000,000—a mere shred of the $32,000,000,000 originally asked by the Reparations Commission in 1921—but rather the spirit of agreement which united former enemies.

It is most essential that Americans understand what an opportunity is theirs to give the world a moral impetus by taking a liberal view on war debt revision to back up the Lausanne accord. That accord has too often been called a plot against American taxpayers. No one in command of the facts could accept such an interpretation.

The reasoning of this argument is that Europe is trying to shove on to America the remaining cost of a war it never caused. To accomplish this dishonest purpose Europe is accused of making a straw agreement at Lausanne, that will relieve Germany of reparations only if America reduces war debts of its former allies. In this view, Lausanne was only a political trick to influence America or cudgel it into debt revision to protect investments in Germany. For if Germany is not relieved of reparations payments to France and other allies, the repayment of American loans would be jeopardized.

Now this is a pretty bit of fabrication, and there are undoubtedly elements in Europe which would like to view Lausanne in that way. But the main facts are all against it. First, the supposition that Germany will be asked to pay more than $714,000,000 if America refuses to reduce war debts, is not well founded. European economists know that the Reich's capacity to pay is limited to that amount.

Statesmen know that any attempt to reimpose more reparations would precipitate serious political and financial disturbances within Germany. In the present state of Europe, those disturbances could not be limited to German borders. Reparations are therefore at an end in accordance with the Lausanne agreement as it is, or in a modified form if the nations make conditions of ratification.

But war debts are not at an end. If America refuses to reduce the $22,000,000,000 due from former allies over the next half century, European nations that have surrendered reparations will be faced with serious financial problems. Up to now, they have drawn money from Germany through reparations, to pay America. An ironical sidelight

on this chain of payments is that Germany borrowed money from America to meet reparations. So America has done the chief paying

Oddly enough this situation is well-nigh inevitable. America became Europe's creditor during the war for precisely the reason that the Old World was financially exhausted. How then could it repay America?

Only through productive growth. Which brings up the very nub of the whole war debt structure. On an understanding of this nub American opinion may well turn and rise to meet the moral challenge of Lausanne.

What did Europe receive for its promise to repay $22,000,000,000 to America? To understand, it is necessary to reconstruct war days. When America entered the war in 1917, the Allies had depleted their purses, one after the other. England was the last, and contiental allies had turned to London for help. Then America's purse opened, and up to the armistice some $6,781,000,000 had been advanced in war credits.

An important point to note about this sum is that not one dollar of it ever crossed the Atlantic. America made the condition that it should be spent for domestic products. So it was material that crossed to Europe, and in its production $6,781,000,000 circulated several times in America. That meant industrial profits, and excess profits taxes for the Government. In one year this item passed $1,000,000,000. There were also income taxes. Farmers prospered, since 25 per cent of the total went into foodstuffs.

Meanwhile, Europe received goods that were eaten or blown up or worn out in the trenches. None of the money had circulated in the borrowers' industrial systems. So there was no means of repayment built up because of the loans, except victory in the war with an implied power to collect reparations from Germany.

England, in its loans to European allies, permitted actual money to cross the channel and circulate in the burrowers' economic system.

So much for the main item in the war debts. After the armistice, payment was necessarily postponed, and during this time additional burrowing to aid reconstruction ran the principal up to $9,811,000,000. By the time this sum had been refunded over some sixty-three years, starting from 1923 to 1927, the principal had grown by addition of interest until it totaled $11,528,354,000.

This principal as funded has never been reduced. There was a reduction of interest rates, and that is the total revision by America to date. It is estimated at about $3,000,000,000.

America stands then, with paper in hand calling for $22,000,000,000 in American currency. Some one must pay it. Europe can not begin to pay it at current rates of exchange. The dollar of credit advanced to Europe in war times represents two dollars worth of labor or material today. Europe must therefore work twice as hard to repay. Meanwhile, American commercial policy makes it more difficult by refusing to accept goods or services in payment.

Yet over a long period these are the only means of absolute repayment. There is not enough gold in Europe to pay without demoralizing

currencies there and so striking back at America. The last resort—more borrowing—is a questionable device that pyramids interest and may add to ultimate debt.

Because of debt burdens and other maladjustments Europe and with it the world, including America, are in dire straits. Out of the fellowship of adversity in Europe came a moral unity that wiped out reparations. Many observers view that act as the first searching measure toward world recovery. It came when France reduced its demands on Germany by 90 per cent. French taxpayers must take up much slack in that revision. Their agreement to do so could arise only from a recognition of the serious state into which affairs have been plunged by the mad orgy of war and its aftermath. Drastic measures are needed. Europe has led the way.

What will America do? No question holds deeper portent for the future. After the November elections action will be in order. It is to be hoped that American opinion will be touched with the deeper humanitarian and moral implications of this issue. The cold statement that Europe borrowed and therefore should repay, overlooks the facts that America derived the chief profit from the loans; that the goods sent to Europe were used by Europeans before American troops could reach France, in fighting a war that had involved American interests; that Europe has practically abolished reparations—the chief asset it gained from expenditure of the loans—and finally, that Europe's capacity to pay has materially declined since the debts were funded.

These considerations provide ample basis for meeting Europe halfway. That continent has literally fallen among thieves. If some of the chief thieves are Europe's own legacy of political and racial antagonisms, that does not alter the situation. Europe has suffered for those sins, and for others not entirely its own. It has reached a remarkable accord fourteen years after the guns ceased to pound.

Will America "pass by on the other side?" If so, it may have to learn through further hard experience that its own prosperity is bound up with that of Europe and the world. Pragmatic reasons for revision, such as benefits that may accrue to America, have studiously been excluded from this article, because they apply chiefly if America plays the role of a Levite or "certain priest" in the parable.

If it accepts the role of Good Samaritan, the economic benefits of revision will follow as surely as world prosperity will thereby be given a mighty impetus. Whether or no, the moral challenge of Lausanne remains to be answered.—*The Christian Leader.*

Kicking God from the Sky

By James H. Watt

The author of this article was born in Illinois, and acquired his education in the country schools and high school in Iowa, working on a farm until his high school training was completed. ¶ He attended Armour Institute of Technology, Chicago, graduating with a Bachelor's degree in Civil Engineering in 1922, when he signed up with several

construction firms until 1929. ¶ Since July, 1931 he has been speaking in various parts of this country in an effort to correct communistic propaganda and to arouse Americans to the Soviet menace.

In December, 1929, I accepted a contract with a Chicago firm for work in Soviet Russia. The firm had agreed to send a commission of American engineers to Soviet Russia for a period of three years to give technical assistance in the development of the coal industry under the five year plan. The contract was accepted in the spirit of adventure coupled with the desire to see this so-called five year plan in action. A rather substantial salary, seventy-five per cent of which was to be paid in gold, was also a strong inducement at the time.

Many of my friends urged me not to go. They told me that the Soviet plans and objectives constituted a menace to our country; that the Russian people were being exploited as never before; that government based purely on atheism was all wrong. However, as I was very ignorant on the subject of Communism, these objections were ignored and laughed at as I departed with my wife for Soviet Russia.

We arrived in Kharkov, the capital of the Ukraine, in late January, 1930. For the first four months we were veritable babes in the wood. We were taken here, we were taken there, shown the nurseries, the homes for the wild boys, the new factories, the new apartments and office buildings, invited to concerts in the various *red corners*, wined and dined, and much fussed over. But after the first four months things began to take on a color, a meaning. We knew we had been treated as alert tourists realize they are handled. As the attention of the officials began to be directed elsewhere, we, in turn, began to look about by ourselves. I bent every effort to learn the Russian language. We made friends who in turn informed us. This all led to my complete disillusionment. In talking quietly and privately with bricklayers, plumbers, carpenters, peasants, bank employes, clerks, and engineers, I was amazed to find that not of them is in sympathy with the present régime. I found that only the youth and the communist backed up the government when questioned privately.

To tell of my intensive education in Soviet affairs, of the forced and slave labor, the fear, the misery, the destruction, the lack, would go beyond the limits of this article. I will simply say that, after fifteen months, I quietly made my plans and withdrew from the commission, gave up my contract, and returned to the United States, via Siberia, at my own expense. I desire no further dealings with the Soviet government. Upon returning to the United States, I have been deeply concerned to see how many of our good professors, economists, and other citizens, not to mention the congressmen, are unwittingly being made the dupes of this monstrous scheme, while, should they but know it, if the world revolutionary program of the Soviet communists succeed, they would be among the first to be *liquidated*. I am deeply concerned to find the American public grossly misinformed on the subject and lulled into the idea that the Soviet Union constitutes no menace to our country.

But to go on: The destruction of religion as it is being carried out in Soviet Russia is a story of utter ruthlessness. The scenes witnessed by us in Kharkov are but typical of those going on through that vast country once known as Russia. When we first arrived in Kharkov, the churches were nearly all open, the bells were ringing, the services unmolested. But within a week the scene began to change. First, the bells were removed. Gangs of workers climbed to the belfries and cut the bells from their mountings. Next cables were hooked on and the bells were dragged to the edges of the belfries by means of hand windlasses. At the edge of the belfries the cables were cut loose and the bells allowed to fall with the following results: the fronts of the churches were damaged, the church steps were smashed, and the bells were smashed. This afforded the communists great satisfaction, for the damaged churches and the smashed steps made it more difficult for the still faithful congregation to go to church and the smashed bells were easy to load and haul away on the small one-horse wagons. Several reasons for the removal of the bells were advanced for the benefit of tourists. One was that the ringing of the bells disturbed the workers in the early morning. Another was that the bells contained silver and this was needed for the coining of currency. At any rate, within a few weeks after our arrival the bells had been removed from nearly every church in Kharkov, a city of some 500,000 inhabitants with many churches.

After the bells had been removed, the closing began. We are told that there is no law against having a church in Soviet Russia. Well, there isn't but they have many schemes for closing them. A meeting will be called to vote on the matter. The meeting will be attended by a large group of young communists who will suggest that the church be turned into a club, a garage, a granary, a shop, or whatnot. Put to a vote, the assembled crowd is unanimously in favor of the suggestion and the church is closed.

This seemd very strange to me until I learned how those meetings are closely watched by the GPU (secret police) and how no one dares to vote contrary to the motion for fear of his life. When the authorities wished to close the beautiful cathedral in the square in the center of the city, they levied a tax of one million roubles on it. The impoverished worshippers had no possible means of raising such a sum as you can well imagine. The authorities then joyfully announced that the people did not want their church, and closed it. And so it goes over the whole country. Some people are laboring under the delusion that it is only the Greek Orthodox Church that is being persecuted. I had that naive idea myself until the truth of the matter was learned. Continuous attempts were made to close the Polish Catholic church in Kharkov, and only by paying huge taxes solicited from everyone by the Polish consul was it kept open. Similar attempts were made to close the German Lutheran church, but when the German consul stated that if they closed the church they also closed the consulate the matter was ended.

After a goodly number of churches were closed, the "blowing up"

began. During our stay in Kharkov two of the finest cathedrals, beautiful examples of Byzantine architecture, were blown up. This method of removing the structures is used because it is quickly done and it also is done for the effect on the populace, as it is made very spectacular. The destruction of the aforementioned cathedral in the square was accomplished with four shots on different days. First, the large central dome was blown up and it fell with a mighty crash into the midsection of the interior. Then, the front wall of the building was blown out leaving the church in utter ruin. Finally, the side walls were blown down with two separate shots. All in all, a very neat and efficient job, according to the authorities. All of the brick and stone was then crushed by hand to be hauled away and used in the foundations of a new factory. Another beautiful cathedral was blown up to make way for the largest opera house in Europe, but as yet not a sign of the construction of this building is to be seen although two years have elapsed since the church was destroyed.

The persecution and elimination of the members of the clergy is an important and terrible part of this program to "kick God from the sky." No member of the clergy is allowed to have a food card. Neither he nor any member of his family is allowed to work. Further than that he is not allowed to beg. We have seen many of these elderly men standing with head bowed in the market place, an old basket on the arm. As the peasants pass, they put into the basket a hunk of black bread or a few kopeks, and as long as the priest does not ask for alms he is not molested. But should he be caught doing anything that could be construed as begging, he would immediately be arrested. During our stay a drive against hoarding silver was made. One priest who had saved one hundred roubles was shot and many were arrested for possessing any amount over five roubles. The plan is to destroy completely these unfortunate people by the end of the five year plan.

The tiny tot in Soviet Russia has as his first writing lesson, "There is no God." All children are taught to hate the Church and any form of religion. All are taught that there is no God. The result of this form of education you can well imagine. The youth of the country is absolutely atheistic, a mocking, scoffing crowd of young ruffians who lose no opportunity to join in the ridicule and persecution of the clergy and the destruction of the church. As we attended the Easter service in the large cathedral in one end of the city (Easter, 1931) large groups of these young atheists came into the church. They lighted cigarettes from the altar candles, they mocked and ridiculed the bishop, some of them had stones to throw at him but were prevented from so doing by officers who feared a riot should they do so.

The children are taught to have no respect for their parents. They are taught to spy on their parents and to report any religious or anti-communist leanings their parents may profess. They are taught that they belong to the State and that they must aid the State in ridding the country of God and religion. They are taught to worship Lenin and the tractor as their God and to embrace Communism as their religion. I have had many parents tell me with tears in their eyes that

they dare not punish their children for fear that the children will report them with the result that they would be arrested and the children adopted by the State.

Not a very pleasant picture, is it? And yet how many of our citizens in all walks of life look upon this scene as a "great experiment" and view it with tolerance and even sympathy. It must surely be due to ignorance such as my ignorance of three years ago, or to the acceptance as fact of the vast amount of erroneous information pressed upon us by agents or unwitting dupes of the Communist International whose fiendish objectives is to drive religion from the face of the earth and God from the sky as an aid in their mad scheme of world revolution.

—*The Living Church.*

© 1932. All rights reserved.

Is a Moral Code Sufficient? *

W. W. Warner

> Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. Romans 13: 8.

Thomas Huxley said, "The deepest sin against the human mind is to believe things without evidence." Religious beliefs, for the most part, have been founded, not on carefully weighed evidence, but on uncriticised desire, ecstatic experience, and false logic. It is better to have fewer beliefs than to have so many that are not true. A creed based upon a multitude of unproved theories is a house of straw on shifting sand. The modern thought on matters of religion is that they should be greatly simplified. Instead of a peace that passeth understanding, man wants a peace that is both understandable and practical. The religions of the past have been so complicated as to be beyond the comprehension of the average man.

The Book of Leviticus contains approximately twenty-six thousand words. These, together with the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the mythical miracles accorded to Jesus, and the Apostles' Creed, form the basis for the religion of the average orthodox Christian. It is little wonder that our young people, just out of high school and college, show such a marked disinterest in matters of religion.

Thinking men no longer accept the doctrine that our natures are rooted in infamy and that the desires of the flesh are cunning traps set by Satan, with God's permission, to undo us. They believe that sin is misdirected energy, and that there is no Devil but fear, and that the universe is planned for good. The man who lives for the present, forgetful of the past and unafraid of the future, is the man of wisdom. Living up to one's best at all times is simple, safe, and practical. It is the good way of life. Do not depend on a death-bed repentance as being sufficient to your needs. Practise the Golden Rule daily.

* A sermon preached in the First Universalist Church of Kent, Ohio, on July 24, 1932, observed as Laymen's Sunday. Published by us for the sole purpose of giving information on the extreme left of Universalism. *Editor.*

Our own Universalist Church has made an honest effort to simplify religion. It has succeeded in reducing the articles of faith to five in number. Recent discussions seem to indicate the possibility of a further simplification. It is my personal opinion that the time is not far distant when the present five articles will be replaced with a single statement, emphasizing four words, the Brotherhood of Man, "for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." To criticise is easy, but it is my thought that religion would be further advanced, more stabilized and of greater importance to the human race today, if the founders of the faith had started with a few simple moral precepts and then had added from time to time such other items as may have proved of value after a thorough trial.

Man seems to have been extremely inconsistent in his thinking on the matter of religion. In the arts and sciences he started at the bottom, but on the question of religion he seems to have started at the top. He accepted as fact the most notoriously inconsistent hypothesis that man has ever been guilty of inventing. This has made it necessary for the succeeding generations to undergo the exceedingly slow process of eliminating these false theories. The process has done away with such theories as eternal damnation, witchcraft, the fall of man, the sacrifice for sin, the resurrection of the body, the immaculate conception, and so on down to the climax of man's error in religion, the Apostles' Creed. Through the persistent efforts and personal sacrifices of a small group of clear thinking, liberal-minded men and women there has, during the past century and a half, been a slow but gradual trend toward a *simplified religion*. We are slowly coming to adopt a moral code as a sufficient basis for our religious needs. There are many obstacles, however, that will have to be overcome. It is reported that the sanitary engineers, cleaning up the Panama Canal Zone by destroying the disease-bearing mosquitoes, had difficulty persuading a priest to remove from the doorway of his church a basin of holy water that was alive with larvae. Yes, it will take a long time to break down all of the age-old beliefs and superstitions. Learned men and women no longer believe that earthquakes and floods and pestilence are the results of the wrath of an angry God; but there are still many who hesitate to accept a simple moral code as the all-sufficient in religion. The evolution is slow but the final result is inevitable.

The question may be raised, and properly, whether there will be a need for the church in its present form after we have learned the simplicity and real meaning of religion. This, in my opinion, depends largely upon the future trend of our institutions of learning and other organizations of a public and semi-public nature. If these institutions adopt a proper course of training, covering the period in the child's life from four to eighteen years, there will probably be little need for the church. This time, however, lies a considerable distance in the future and will no doubt be solved with little difficulty when the time arrives. At present the church is of paramount importance to our race. Our children need its moral influence and the lessons that it teaches about things that are essential to the full life.

This is the immediate task of the liberal church. In order that we may do our work effectively it is necessary that we be liberal in deed, as well as in word. Our ministers in their pulpits and our teachers in the church schools should teach a liberal religion that is true to its name. We must guard diligently against teaching anything of a *supernatural nature.* The day of miracles is past, and should be forever forgotten. If we have any among us who by reason of their early training are confused in mind over the prevalent contradictions in the faith of our fathers, we owe it to them to explain the beauty and simplicity of the liberal religion. By a careful and intelligent explanation of our liberal views we eliminate all refuse, all impurity, all dross, and leave only the pure gold. The gold of brotherly love, the gold of true friendships, man's priceless heritage.

The story is told of a rich bachelor lawyer in San Francisco who had a Chinese servant, named Sam. Sam and his master had lived together for fifteen years. The servant knew the wants of his employer as though he were his other self. If there were to be guests, one or one hundred, Sam was told the number, that was all, and everything was provided. This servant was cook, valet, watchman and friend. The lawyer grew to have a deep affection for his friend. He paid him a good salary and tried to devise other ways of showing gratitude for faithfulness. But one morning as Sam poured his master's coffee, he said quietly, "Next week I leave you." The lawyer thought it was because of the salary, but Sam assured him that this was not the reason. Finally, after considerable query on the part of the lawyer, Sam made this explanation: "I go to China, my brother he in prison. He young, twenty-six, I fifty. He have wife and baby. In China they take any man same family, to die. I go to China, give my money to my brother. He live, I die." "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law."

Two important factors enter every man's life—heredity and environment. Both are directly affected, either for good or ill, by the moral code that may be in force during the life of the individual. Heredity is a difficult problem, but its influence can eventually be corrected by the intelligent observance of the laws of eugenics. Environment is fundamentally a question of morality. Individuals who go through life suffering from disease and bodily pain are seldom cheerful. On the other hand, persons born of healthy parents and in good physical condition are usually good-natured and reasonably happy. The latter condition can not be brought about by prayer, or by faith in a supernatural being. It can be made a reality by observing a sensible moral code.

The question of birth control was very ably presented by our minister several months ago in his sermon entitled, "The Frontiers of Religion." This is only one phase of the moral code, but it is an important one. Ordinary intelligence teaches us that a nation of happy and prosperous people can never result from the propagation of morons. Certain religious organizations are trying to discourage the free and open discussion of this important question, but progress is being made

through the efforts of some of our more courageous instructors in institutions of higher learning. Disease and suffering are being lessened; the length of human life is being increased; epidemics of contagious diseases that have swept multitudes of human lives from the face of the earth are being stamped out. This is being accomplished, not by prayer, or the laying on of hands, or fasting, or prostrating ourselves against a wailing-wall, but by intelligent cooperation between those engaged in science and in the study of medicine. Epidemics are usually started either through carelessness or through ignorance. Either one is a trespass against the moral code by which we should live. Ignorance in matters of religion has caused untold millions to suffer.

In conclusion let me summarize briefly the things that I have tried to say. We should not believe blindly. We should not be influenced by man-made creeds. We should not labor under the delusion that we can rob our neighbor and expect a last minute pardon, as is suggested in the story of the thief on the cross. We must use our talents and influence in trying to simplify and clarify religion. We should aid in every reasonable way the effort to establish a religion based on a moral code rather than on a guess as to the nature of future life. We should so live each day that we can look our neighbor in the face at eventide and say, "I have been your friend today."

When we can say with the poet,

"I would be true, for there are those who trust me;
I would be pure, for there are those who care;
I would be strong, for there is much to suffer;
I would be brave, for there is much to dare;

"I would be friend of all—the foe, the friendless;
I would be giving, and forget the gift;
I would be humble, for I know my weakness;
I would look up, and laugh, and love, and lift;"

when we have said this, and when the sun is dying in the west, and the dew is falling on the grass, and the waterlily closes for the night, and the song-bird eases her melody, then shall the consciousness say to the spirit, about to start its voyage out into the limitless space of our glorious universe, "I have lived a good life."

Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)

Our Changing Civilization. How Science and the Machine are Reconstructing Modern Life, by *John Herman Randall, Jr.*, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University. Author of "The Making of the Modern Mind." Fred A. Stoke's Company, New York, 1929. 362 pages.

That we are living in a time of change; that we are passing through a period of transition, is generally admitted. But what are the prime factors bringing about this change; and how this change affects not only our mode of living, but our morality, our art and our religion, is not so universally seen and interpreted. Some of us think that the basic elements of our religion and our moral consciousness will remain the same in the new civilization as they were in the old. The author does not share this confidence. He says, "in the new civilization it will not be surprising if men put on the same level the Norse or Congo mythologies and Christian theology. All that is specifically Christian and European may well by that time have been overshadowed by the reconstructed tradition of Chinese social morality and Japanese art." The chief agents responsible for the tremendous change of the modern life are, according to the writer, science and the machine. Pure science seeks to give us a reliable picture of how the world and man came into being. It shows how the universe is wholly under the sway of natural law. Applied science has given us technology, with its inventions and discoveries made available by the machine. The machine has its place in the modern factory with its mass production. Machine and factory have their natural habitat in the city. To own and run such factories requires a great deal of capital. The capitalists, because owning the factories, are the real masters of modern society. Their power is more far-reaching and better protected than that of the slave-owners of the past.

Right in the first chapter the author gives us a striking picture of the vivid contrast between the old and the new culture. Traveling through some of the provinces of Italy, he saw the country life of Tuscany in its ancient primitiveness, the same as it was 800 years before; with the church in the centre and the people plowing their fields as their ancestors in the eleventh century. Then he came north and stopped at Munich. There he saw in the German Museum the whole modern development of the machine age graphically and impressively

presented. It seemed to transport him into a different world and yet it was a most real and powerful world; the world of the machine, transforming and reconstructing life on a new basis, making it richer in worldly goods, but containing not a bit of religion or art or any other higher values.

The writer now attempts to survey the historical development of our civilization, to show whence it came. Of course this is a difficult and complicated task and requires his going over the same ground again and again. He pays due respect to the *vital periods* of history. He has a good deal to say on the Renaissance, the influence of newly discovered Greece, the glorious twelfth and thirteenth centuries with their Dantes, Thomases (of Aquinas); their cathedrals and crusades. But he fails to attach any great importance to the Reformers and the Reformation. Luther and Calvin are barely mentioned. Their faith or religion, according to him, had little to do with the forward movement of the times. It was rather the result of social changes. Cities, magistrates and princes gladly availed themselves of the change to arrange their affairs without the interference of the church. Besides, the Reformation did not bring a really new thing spiritually. The Reformers largely remained in the thought-forms of the old religion. The Bible was made a fetish and put in the place of the pope. A narrow orthodoxy settled down on the church and the new religious bondage was often worse than the old one.

It is quite customary so to discount the merits of the Reformation. Nevertheless it can hardly be denied that it was in many ways the religious emancipation of the spirit. Whatever one may say of the scholarliness of Erasmus, we prefer the courage and rough virtues of the Reformer. He was the hero of the new age, and the elemental force of his personality finds no appreciation in this book.

The Renaissance liberated the intellectual life of many from the shackles of church-controlled thinking. It ushered in an era of creative art that could well stand comparison with Greece in its Periclean splendor. But most of its leaders were without moral earnestness and religious interest. The power to defy church and state in defence of new convictions came from faith, not from science or art. It had its origin in Palestine, not in Greece; in the Bible, not in Plato or Aristotle.

The period of real adjustment to a changing world, so the writer contends, was the *Enlightenment* (die "Aufklaerung") of the eighteenth century. On the basis laid by Cartesius in philosophy and the great Isaac Newton in physics, a new world view was constructed which was secular in all respects. The great Diana worshiped by a host of thinkers was *Reason.* Proudly the new era was called the "Age of Reason." Morality as well as religion had their source in man's reasoning powers. God, virtue and immortality were the three articles of the creed of natural religion. But while the Renaissance had called philosophy and art to new life, thereby benefiting the upper classes only, the Enlightenment coincided with the birth of modern business.

Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" proclaimed that the business man (and the middle class) was the master of the new time. The government was to take off its hands from business. Free competition and a laissez-faire policy on the part of the state was demanded.

Just as far-reaching was the change in the political sphere. There were a number of revolutions. Rousseau's ideal of the state as a social contract, of government by the people and for the people, spread through the lands like wild-fire. Most of all, the United States were affected by the new political gospel. America still lives in the intellectual atmosphere of the Enlightenment. Our fathers, says the writer, intended to prevent any social control of business; and so do we, or our business world does, and we have not made any headway in this direction. We claim to be ahead of other lands in politics and business as well; and yet we are more conservative politically and socially than almost all other countries.

The writer now proceeds to show how the new forces, the "City and the Laboratory," he calls them, affect our religion, our art and our moral life. We shall only briefly mention the religious consequences, as he sees them. Fundamentalism clashes loudly with the main currents of our national life. The Liberals are ready to accept the approved results of the scientific method, while at the same time preserving their vital convictions. There is no agreement, though, as to what these ultimate convictions are. Besides, the Liberals have just as little as the conservatives been able to obtain social control of business. The laboring world is, therefore, largely lost to religion. In the city the influence of the church is insignificant. The competition of other interests is stifling the religious life.

What is going to be the outcome? "Christianity and Judaism are the accumulated heritage of thousands of saints and prophets and scholars and seers. Their discoveries and insights are too precious to be lost." A real prophet's influence goes far deeper and lasts longer than that of the scientist.

We see the writer is by no means unmindful of the surpassing importance of religious values. On the other hand, he is not sure but what in the new civilization Christian theology may be put on a level with Congo mythologies (see above). So we feel that his faith in Christ is, at best, not of a very substantial character. There is no final truth, he says, to the investigator. He could hardly accept, therefore, St. John's fourteenth chapter. About the future he does not want to prophesy. He is sure that we will not give up the laboratory, the machine and the city. How to get social control, he doesn't know. We don't blame him, for who knows?

The book furnishes a lot of information. It travels over a large field and a long past. As to its analysis of the present, the writer is correct in many respects. A note of greater certainty in important areas of human life would have made it considerably more appealing to us.

The Church School Comes to Life, by *Mildred Hewitt.* New York, The McMillan Company, 1932. 341 pages.

The author is an officer of the Department of Religious Education of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Her book is written from the standpoint of an Episcopalian, with the Sunday School of the Episcopal Church in mind, but that does not preclude it from being useful to the schools of other churches. Her idea of the Sunday School is of the very highest. The very name she adopts—Church school, not Sunday school—implies a higher conception of the institution. It has to do not with Sunday only but with the life of the whole week. Even the name "Bible school" does not satisfy her. Of course the school uses the Bible as one of its chief means of teaching, but since the modern idea of training of the young is not the impartation of Bible knowledge only, she prefers to call the School a Church school, the school maintained and operated by the Church for the training of her youth in Christian living.

The readers of the book will find that the actual Sunday School is very far from the ideal herein presented. The writer, adopting Fosdick's way of putting it, calls the Sunday School "a group of boys and girls and their leaders keeping fellowship with Jesus, and learning how to live, keeping fellowship with Jesus in the sacraments and services of the Church, in the search for truth, in the life of prayer, in the adventure of Kingdom-building. Learning through this fellowship how to live as followers of Jesus in every situation—at home, on the playground, in school, in the neighborhood, in political, economic and international life."

"Through the Church school boys and girls will learn to build a new kind of society. Adult leaders can only point the way to the Kingdom; it remains with the boys and girls to take up the task of building it and in turn to pass on this task to future generations." 'Christian religious education is equally concerned on the one hand with mysticism and on the other with social living. The secret communion of the soul with God and the audacious adventure of universal brotherhood are the twin essentials of our religious education. The practice of the Presence of God and the practice of the Brotherhood of Men."

When we read such idealistic statements and compare with them the actual facts and present achievements of the Sunday School, we cannot help noticing the discrepancy. The writer knows herself that in practice we approximate the ideal only very gradually. She knows that e. g. we need to have better trained teachers than are now available and she devotes a chapter of more than forty pages to the "Training of Leaders." She also knows that the physical environment (the building, class room equipment and materials for activities) is in numberless cases insufficient and makes satisfactory work well-nigh impossible.

But the real emphasis of the book is on the writer's idea of religious education. She is of the opinion that the old way of teaching consisted chiefly in "studying the lesson," and that this study was

mainly the impartation of knowledge. To her religious education is training in Christian living. We learn to live by experience, we grow in Christian life by doing. So the Church school must provide such experiences that result in Christian ideals and attitudes. It is the task of the teachers to *share* with their pupils the convictions and habits that have been built up in themselves. They will only be able to do this if the material and method of their teaching is closely related to the needs and experiences of the pupils. The curriculum of the school, or the class, is to be so constructed that it supplies selected and guided experiences suited to the ages and capacities of the boys and girls. We see that the writer dwells a great deal on the religious *experiences* that the pupil is to get in the Church school, in the lesson period, in the worship and in the activities of the school. The present writer has never had a chance to see how the School or the teacher could furnish such religious experiences right along, so he doesn't feel competent to pass judgment on this main feature of the book. He knows very well that the teaching ought to be impressive, intelligible and practical, but to make it a religious *experience* in every case, seems a rather large order.

Another characteristic note in the book is its stress on the democratic nature of the Sunday School. She insists at all times that not only the teachers but the scholars too must be consulted in making plans for new work; in building the curriculum, in preparing for every phase of the Sunday School's program.

The scope of the Sunday School education is world wide. It begins with the pupil's own life, his relation to the home, the neighbors, school. As he grows older, his eyes are opened to his place in the community. He begins to see his responsibility for the new industrial order, for the new internationalism. There are chapters in the book on the use of money, on the different kinds of records (forty pages) on educative activity. All through the book the author shows her intimate acquaintance with all phases of Sunday School work, its handicaps and difficulties and its great and recognized possibilities. She is very thorough and practical in discussing its problems, hopeful in her outlook and idealistic as to the goals of the institution. A great book for Sunday School workers of any kind, a result of practical experience and an incitement to higher aims and more earnest efforts.

Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

VOLUME 60 NOVEMBER, 1932 NUMBER 6

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.

Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

Contents for the Year 1932

JANUARY

PAGE

Religion in an Era of Readjustment by Prof. E. E. Arndt 1
Glory of the Cross by Fred. Stoerker 9
Our Confirmation Tradition by O. A. Wagner 17
Betätigung des christlichen Charakters. Von Prof. Grützmacher 24
Ist ein Bekenntnis des Glaubens nötig? Von Dr. C. Schieler 33
Editorials 40
Christian World 49
Book Review 66

MARCH

Sermon Sketches, J. O. Reller 81
Religion and Readjustment, Prof. E. E. Arndt 95
Eschatologie. Prof. W. Petersmann 106
Betätigung des christlichen Charakters. Prof. Grützmacher 115
Glaubensbekenntnis. Dr. Schieler 124
Editorials 132
Christian World 140
Book Review 148

MAY

Reconstruction of Prayer, by G. A. Friz 161
Modern Preaching, by W. Bechtold 169
Sermon Sketches, by W. Berlekamp 178
Der christliche Charakter. Prof. Grützmacher 188
Goethe und das Christentum. Dr. C. Schieler 196
Barth und die evang. Kirche. K. Barkau 206
Editorials 213
Christian World 221
Book Review 228

Contents for the Year 1932

JULY

PAGE

The Ancient Classics, Dr. H. J. Schick 241
Sermon Sketches, E. H. Hoefer 250
Adult Education, H. L. Streich 260
United Luth. Church, J. H. Steger 267
Der Chriſt und die Kirche. Prof. Grützmacher 271
Kürzung des Predigergehalts. Dr. Schuetze 280
Editorials 283
Christian World 292
Book Review 307

SEPTEMBER

The Heidelberg Catechism, Editor 321
Character Education, A. A. Susott 329
Sermon Sketches, Dr. Schick 335
Unterſcheidung der Geſchlechter. Prof. Grützmacher 347
Philoſophiſche Strömungen. C. Hartwig 356
Chriſtliche Oekumenik. Prof. Petersmann 363
Editorials 371
Christian World 379
Book Review 388

NOVEMBER

Sermon Sketches, F. C. Rueggeberg 401
Why Not Catholic? Dr. Stave 413
Admit the Negro? W. H. Schlinkmann 422
Conceptions of God, G. Nussmann 427
Der Chriſt in der Ehe. Prof. Grützmacher 436
Friedrich Nietzſche. Dr. C. Schieler 444
Editorials 453
Christian World 460
Book Review 476

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

.60
932

Theological magazine of the Evangelical Synod of North America v.60 1932

GTU Library
3 2400 00307 7223